Daily Report

East Europe

FBIS-EEU-92-040
Friday
28 February 1992

Daily Report
East Europe

FBIS-EEU-92-040 28 February 1992

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

FRONT PAGE

ALBANIA

Lushnje, Pogradec Crowds Attack Food Warehouses 2
Death Follows Lushnje Looting *[Tirana Radio]* 2
Third Day of Pogradec Looting *[Tirana Radio]* 2
Government Discusses Public Order *[Tirana Radio]* 2
Squatters Repel Police With Molotov Cocktails *[Tirana Radio]* 3
Socialist Party Electoral Program Outlined *[ATA]* 3
PD Electoral Campaign Opens at Tirana Rally *[Tirana Radio]* 4

BULGARIA

Security Council To Investigate Plot Allegations *[BTA]* 5
SDS Parliamentary Group Threatens Ban on BSP *[DEMOKRATSIYA 20 Feb]* 5
BSP Ability To Incite Nationalism Viewed *[PODKREPA 21 Feb]* 6
Agricultural Production, Livestock Decline in 1991 *[DUMA 24 Feb]* 6

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Dienstbier Interviewed on FRG Treaty Preparations *[Hamburg TV]* 7
FRG's Kohl Arrives in Prague To Sign Treaty 7
Kohl, Havel Holds Preliminary Talks *[Prague Radio]* 7
Kohl, Havel Sign CSFR-German Treaty *[Hamburg DPA]* 7
Havel Addresses Signing Ceremony *[Prague TV]* 7
Kohl Speech at Treaty Signing *[Prague TV]* 8
Havel, Kohl Hold Joint News Conference *[Prague Radio]* 9
Kohl Thanks CSFR for Opening to East Germans *[CSTK]* 13
Kohl Meets With CSFR Parliamentarians *[CSTK]* 13
Havel, Kohl Review Goals at Gala Dinner *[Prague Radio]* 13
2,000 Protest Treaty Signing *[CSTK]* 13
Dienstbier Discusses Treaty Signed With Russia *[NARODNA OBRODA 19 Feb]* 13
Georgia Delegation Discusses Expanding Cooperation *[CSTK]* 14
Slovak National Council Resolution on Milovy Treaty *[Bratislava PRAVDA 26 Feb]* 15
Poll Shows HZDS 'Likely Winner' for Jun Elections *[CSTK]* 15
Solon Kavan Wrongly Accused of StB Collaboration *[CSTK]* 15
Intercepted Tanks for Syria Unloaded in Szczecin *[CSTK]* 16

POLAND

Sejm Continues Debate on Socioeconomic Policy *[PAP]* 17
Approves 1992 Socioeconomic Guidelines *[Warsaw Radio]* 17
Walesa on Political Power, Ties With Moscow *[Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Feb]* 17
Poll Shows Support for Government Policy Changes *[WPROST 23 Feb]* 19

ROMANIA

Spokeswoman Confirms General Elections in May *[ROMPRES]* 21
Electoral Commission Checks Fraud Claims *[ROMPRES]* 21
New Bucharest Mayor Halaicu Discusses Tasks *[TINERETUL LIBER 25 Feb]* 21
New Mayor To Investigate Abuses *[CURIERUL NATIONAL 25 Feb]* 22

Roman Interviewed on FSN, Election Issues *[AZI 25 FEB]* 22
UDMR To Continue in Democratic Convention *[ROMPRES]* 23
Election Results From Tulcea, Dolj Announced *[Bucharest Radio]* 23
More Polls Scheduled for 1, 8 Mar, 19 Apr *[Bucharest Radio]* 23
Official on Hungarian Defense Minister's Visit *[ROMPRES]* 23

YUGOSLAVIA

International

Hungarian Policy Against Serbia Attacked *[NARODNA ARMIJA 13 Feb]* 24

Interrepublic

Croats, Bosnian Serbs Hold 'Secret Talk' in Graz *[Vienna DER STANDARD 27 Feb]* 25

Federal

Arms Stored in Bar Port Become State Property *[TANJUG]* 25
Survey Shows Domestic, Foreign Orders Growing *[TANJUG]* 25

Bosnia-Hercegovina

Izetbegovic Expects Majority for Independence *[Vienna Radio]* 26
Party Leaders Assess 3d Round of Sarajevo Talks *[Sarajevo Radio]* 27
Bank Official Sees Republic Currency by 5 Mar *[TANJUG]* 27
Bosnia's Croatian Rights Party Hold Conference *[VJESNIK 5 Feb]* 28

Croatia

Vekic Confirms 'Open Secret' on Departure *[TANJUG]* 28
Sporadic Fighting Breaks Out in 'Crisis Zones' *[TANJUG]* 29
Statement Issued on Truce Violation in Drnis *[TANJUG]* 29
Problems With Citizenship Applications Detailed *[BORBA 10 Feb]* 29

Montenegro

Bulatovic Says Border at Prevlaka 'Unsustainable' *[TANJUG]* 30
Albanians Demand Investigation of 1945 Massacre *[Tirana Radio]* 30

Serbia

Assembly Holds First Extraordinary Session 27 Feb 31
Bakocevic Opens Meeting *[Belgrade Radio]* 31
Milosevic Addresses Assembly *[Belgrade Radio]* 31
Deputies Debate Milosevic Speech *[Belgrade Radio]* 36
Assembly Supports Peace Moves *[TANJUG]* 39
Foreign Media Reaction to Milosevic Report Cited *[TANJUG]* 40
Bozovic Opposes Magyars' Demands for Autonomy *[Budapest TV]* 40
Bozovic: Serbs Unlike Hungarians, Albanians *[TANJUG]* 40
Liberal Party Leader Says Opposition Ineffective *[NIN 14 Feb]* 41

Yugoslavia

Serbia—President Slobodan Milosevic addressed an extraordinary session of the Serbian Assembly in Belgrade on 27 February on the "increasing interethnic friction" which has caused an "armed war" in the last few years, Belgrade radio reports. Milosevic feels that portraying Serbia as an "aggressor was incorrect and unjust. It took a few months and a lot of effort to explain to the world and, above all, Europe that Serbia did not cause the war and that it does not want it." Milosevic ended his speech by saying that the "imminent deployment of UN peacekeeping forces in Yugoslavia to separate Croats and Serbs undoubtedly heralds an end to armed conflicts." He also urged the Assembly to adopt the document that would create an alliance with Montenegro.

After a 13-hour debate, deputies agreed to support Milosevic's proposals for a peaceful settlement. The conclusions adopted by the deputies states that "the UN Security Council decision to send a peacekeeping force... represents a victory for peace and the affirmation of Serbia's efforts in the world to stop the violence against the Serbian people by the Croatian authorities, which is at the root of the Yugoslav crisis..." The deputies also extend "full support" to the pact with Montenegro creating a "common state."

Bosnia-Hercegovina—The future organization of Bosnia-Hercegovina was discussed at the third round of talks held in Sarajevo on 27 February, Sarajevo radio reports. The Party of Democratic Action, the Serbian Democratic Party, and the Croatian Democratic Party revealed at a news conference that "a certain amount of progress had been made but more meetings were needed to come to a final solution." Radovan Karadzic, representative for the Serbian Democratic Party, stated that the purpose of the talks was "to secure full equality and prosperity for their people" in a changed Yugoslavia. Mate Boban, Croatian Democratic Party delegate, remarked that the parties are "well on their way to finally agreeing on all those important interests for every people in Bosnia-Hercegovina."

Croatia—TANJUG reports that Internal Affairs Minister Ivan Vekic's transfer to another post is an "open secret." Citing GLOBUS, he is reportedly to take over as public prosecutor. Ivan Jarnjak of the Croatian police will replace Vekic. Vekic states that he first heard about his transfer through "unofficial sources" and later he was "officially informed," and concluded that "he would probably not take the offered position, but would return to Osijek."

Czechoslovakia

President Vaclav Havel and FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl signed the CSFR-FRG treaty on good-neighborliness in Prague on 27 February, Hamburg DPA reports. In a speech carried by Prague TV, Havel said the treaty marks "the beginning of a new era" of "understanding, mutual trust, and fruitful cooperation" "which will definitely bury all that is bad" in the two countries' history. Kohl stated that he views the treaty as "an expression of our relations of good-neighborliness" and "a signpost for the future relations of coexistence between our peoples," according to Prague TV. Kohl also pointed out that the treaty "emphasizes... the need" for Czechoslovakia's integration "into a future Europe." Addressing himself to President Havel, Kohl said: "You have described the expulsion of the Germans as a profoundly immoral act. We are grateful to you for these frank words." "We must confront our joint history and shape a better future with a clear grasp of past events." CSTK reports that 2,000 people gathered outside Prague Castle to protest the treaty signing.

Albania

Prime Minister Vilson Ahmeti chaired a "special meeting" of the Council of Ministers to discuss "the disturbing state of public order throughout the country," Tirana radio reports. In Lushnje one citizen died following a confrontation with police, and in Pogradec "incalculable" losses were sustained following attacks on food and retail warehouses. The prime minister asked "the forces of order" and the Defense Ministry "to act fast...to stabilize public order" in the towns and "to prevent similar situations in other parts of the country." The Home Trade and Tourism and Food and Light Industry Ministries were instructed "to take steps to ensure that food is quickly distributed."

Lushnje, Pogradec Crowds Attack Food Warehouses

Death Follows Lushnje Looting

AU2602213192 Tirana Radio Tirana Network in Albanian 2100 GMT 26 Feb 92

[Text] According to a report from the Public Order Ministry, crowds of people in Lushnje and Pogradec have in recent days attacked storehouses containing food and other goods. The contingents of police sent to guard the buildings were attacked with solid objects, explosives, and firearms. Faced with this pressure, the forces of order responded in order to disperse the crowds and to protect state property.

The situation around the storehouses of the Retail Enterprises Nos. 1 and 2 in Lushnje became very tense on 25 February. Police responded to the violence of the crowds by using rubber truncheons and firing into the air. According to the information of the Public Order Ministry, one citizen was injured in this incident and died later in the hospital. Fifteen policemen also suffered injuries of various kinds, and three of them have been hospitalized.

Following these acts of destabilization, the Public Order Ministry calls on all honest people to dissociate themselves from such acts of destruction that are being exploited by various delinquent elements to misappropriate the people's food. Isolating these elements will give the police the opportunity to act strongly and without hesitation against criminals, delinquents, and others who seek to further destroy the devastated economy and to sow panic among the people.

Third Day of Pogradec Looting

AU2702150292 Tirana Radio Tirana Network in Albanian 1430 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Report by Ilija Spiro]

[Text] This is the third day in which Pogradec has lived through the most shocking events. There has been looting and destruction in the storehouses of the three retail enterprises, the food enterprise, the beverage storage depot, the metal products storehouse, the agricultural supply enterprise, the knitwear enterprise, the hotel, etc. This is a severe blow to the honest and defenseless people of this town and indeed the entire district. The losses of food and industrial goods are incalculable. Nevertheless, there has been no end to the destruction today. Thousands of people have again gathered in the industrial zone, especially in front of the flour mill, the bakery, the wood-processing enterprise, and the knitwear enterprise. Hundreds of other people are waiting to buy bread at the retail stores. It seems that someone is manipulating the stores of bread and food of the children of the thousands of Pogradec inhabitants who have nothing. As two days ago, thousands of people have continued to seize goods, raw materials, and production equipment in the storehouses and plant of the food and metalwork enterprises without any intervention of the forces of order.

A report from the hospital states that two young civilians have died of suffocation in the press of the crowd, while four officers and 26 soldiers and policemen have been injured in these events. Meanwhile, the Executive Committee, in cooperation with the political parties and the Independent Trade Unions, is analyzing the causes and consequences of these extraordinary events.

[Announcer] We have meanwhile received another report from our reporter in this district, which states that the industrial zone of Pogradec has been almost destroyed in the last three hours. Large crowds of people are continuing to seize everything that they find in the storehouses and factories, in the wood-processing and knitwear enterprises, and in the railroad station. There have also been fires. The damage so far is estimated at 90 million leks. Faced with such a large crowd of people, the present forces of order are impotent. They repeatedly call for help from the government.

Government Discusses Public Order

AU2702152492 Tirana Radio Tirana Network in Albanian 1430 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] The Council of Minister's Press and Information Office informs us that a special meeting of the Council of Ministers was held this morning under the chairmanship of Prime Minister Vilson Ahmeti in order to analyze the disturbing state of public order throughout the country, but especially in Lushnje and Pogradec, and to issue urgent and specific instructions to stabilize the situation.

After hearing reports on the illegal and destructive acts in these two towns from Public Order Minister Vladimir Hysi and Fadil Cani, general director of the police, the members of the government suggested and discussed measures to be taken.

In conclusion, Prime Minister Vilson Ahmeti set tasks for the relevant ministries and local authorities and suggested specific ways of improving cooperation between the forces of order and the justice organs. On behalf of the government, the prime minister asked the forces of order and the Defense Ministry to act fast and energetically to stabilize public order in these two towns and to prevent similar situations in other parts of the country. He asked the investigators, the prosecutors, and the courts to act fast to enforce the laws and to punish lawbreakers. He instructed the district executive committees to cooperate with the forces of order and with institutions and enterprises in order to guard shops and buildings and to prevent such situations from arising. The prime minister said that the government will analyze the public order situation again. The government instructed the Ministry of Home Trade and Tourism and the Ministry of Food and Light Industry to take steps to ensure that food is quickly distributed to consumers.

Squatters Repel Police With Molotov Cocktails

AU2602205392 Tirana Radio Tirana Network in Albanian 1830 GMT 26 Feb 92

[Text] An announcement of the Tirana Public Order Directorate states that officers of Local Police Station No. 2, under Law No. 7,498 of 5 July 1991, amended by Law No. 7,554 of 30 January 1992, went at 0720 today to enforce the Building Construction Enterprise's Claim No. 552 of 19 February 1992 for the forcible eviction of 14 miners' families from Entrance 1/39 of Block 35 on Congress of Lushnje Street. These families occupied 14 flats, an entire stairway of this apartment block, one and a-half years ago.

The odyssey of this verdict goes back to the days of the single-party system and still continues. The forces of order have been there to execute it five times, but each time there was interference both by a judicial body, the state organs, and the government, illegally suspending the execution of the verdict. Even today, when the forces of order were completing the measures for its enforcement, a messenger from the prime minister presented himself to the chief of the local police station, bringing oral instructions from the prime minister not to execute the verdict.

This stand gave courage to the law-breakers, who organized themselves against the forces of order today and threw stones, bricks, fragments of concrete, and Molotov cocktails at them. The forces of order, faced with this situation and seeing that they lacked government support for the enforcement of the law, withdrew.

Socialist Party Electoral Program Outlined

AU2702150392 Tirana ATA in English 1302 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Tirana, February 27 (ATA)—The newspaper "ZERI I POPULLIT" carries the Electoral Program of the Socialist Party [SP] of Albania, which has 6 chapters. It stresses among others:

"The new elections will create possibilities to overcome the serious difficulties and arouse the hopes for a better future. The victory of the SP in these elections would bring the victory of order and law, the flourishing of trade, private and collective business and the victory of labour over confusion and destruction, etc.

The chapter "All-Sided Commitment of the SP to Promotion and Defence of Democracy" stresses among others that the Socialist Party will fight for free democratic elections, for a new democratic constitution, for a consolidation of the legislative, executive, and judicial power, for a broad local self-governing, for an effective judicial state, for a political dialogue and honest political struggle, for social peace as a great national obligation, for guarantee and defence of freedoms and the human rights.

The chapter "The Economic Reform—The Only Alternative To Come Out of the Crisis and the Development of the Country" stresses among others that the Socialist Party is involved in bringing the country out of the crisis and restrain economic fall, to organize a radical reform in economy for its transition into a market economy with social proportions, so that the public or state sector be placed on a new organizational basis. It is also underlined that on the basis of property and private initiative, the forms of joint organization of labour, production and distribution, etc., will be backed up.

The chapter "Modern Technique and Technology for the Transformation of Albania in an Economically Developed Country, With a Democratic Order and Sound Social Base" points out that the technical and technological revival will be the broadest front of labour and investments in all the branches of production and services.

A special chapter of the program says that the SP supports an economy open to the world, naturally integrated, and capable to cooperate and rival with it.

Further on, this chapter points out that the peasant becomes real owner with the complete application of the Law on Land within the first half of 1992, and stresses that the return of the former beys and landlords should not be allowed.

Then, the Electoral Program of the SP continues with the chapter "Vital Interests of the People are the Objective of the SP in the Social Domain." In the chapter "A Decent Place in Europe and the World, National Sovereignty, Territorial Security," it is pointed out that Albania needs a foreign policy which guarantees the country national independence, security and territorial integrity, according to the present world development. The economic and social progress of Albania is impossible without its integration in Europe. The country's interests demand the rapprochement of Albania towards European structures, the Council of Europe, the European Parliament, and in general towards the European Economic Community. The Socialist Party is for an active development of relations with the U.S.A. and for all-sided cooperation with them.

The Electoral Program of the SP points out further on, that foreign policy of Albania, should sanction in a more active way cooperation and relations of good neighbourliness with the countries of the Balkan region.

The program stresses that the SP values the existence of the minority as a bridge of friendship with the neighbouring peoples and adds that it support the policy of recognition of the rights of minority for the language, culture and tradition.

The SP, the program underlines, abides by its stand, that it is high time to solve with objectivity and correctness the question of the Albanians in Kosovo and in other territories in Yugoslavia, the undeniable rights for self-determination and full equality with other nations of

former Yugoslavia on the basis of documents of the CSCE, the Final Act of Helsinki and the Paris Charter. The SP demands that the Cam question should be treated and solved, likewise we demand a more active commitment of the Albanian Government and diplomacy for the establishment of close relations with the Albanian diaspora.

In conclusion, it underlines that the SP, as a party of the European left, has as its immediate objective the full membership in the ranks of the Socialist International.

PD Electoral Campaign Opens at Tirana Rally

AU2602191992 Tirana Radio Tirana Network in Albanian 1430 GMT 26 Feb 92

[Sokol Terihati report on Democratic Party rally in Tirana on 26 February]

[Text] [Shouts of "Heroic Tirana with the Democratic Party" heard] The Democratic Party [PD] announced the beginning of its electoral campaign in the Qemal Stafa National Stadium this morning in the presence of thousands and thousands of citizens from Tirana and other districts of the country. Professor Dr. Ylli Vejsiu, chairman of the PD's Tirana branch, made the opening speech at this rally. The national anthem was then performed [national anthem is heard]. Ylli Vejsiu gave the floor to PD Chairman Sali Berisha, who said among other things:

[Begin Berisha recording] Brothers and sisters, citizens of Tirana, honored guests. The PD opens its electoral campaign today, the campaign of the final victory over communism, the campaign to establish democracy. The 22 March elections mark the final victory of democracy in Albania, the realization of that dream and ideal for which the Albanians waited and suffered for half a century under the communist dictatorship. The PD will win the elections because it succeeded within one year, through common struggle and efforts on the part of all the democratic forces in Albania, in giving back to the Albanians the basic freedoms of the individual, the freedom of speech and thought. [end recording]

Mr. Geoffrey (?Patty), deputy chairman of the British Conservative Party, then greeted the meeting. In his speech, he said among other things:

[Begin (?Patty) recording in English with passage by passage Albanian translation; the following is from the English] The question to be decided on 22 March is very straightforward. Albania needs Western investments in order to rescue her economy and the standard of living of her people. Albania will get Western investments once she has a democratic government freely elected and free of the stains of the old discredited communist and crypto-communist regime. [applause, cheers, whistling] [end recording]

The rally then continued with various pieces of music performed by well-known artists such as Mirush Kabashi, Fadil Hasa, Sherif Merdani, etc.

Security Council To Investigate Plot Allegations

AU2602161292 Sofia BTA in English 1330 GMT 26 Feb 92

[Text] Sofia, February 26 (BTA)—The president has no discrediting materials, the spokesman for the president, Mr. Valentin Stoyanov, told BTA today. He described the attempts to interpret President Zhelyu Zhelev's meeting with Prime Minister Filip Dimitrov and the chairman of parliament, Mr. Stefan Savov, on February 24 as a conflict between state institutions as "provocative statements, seeking to give political development a certain direction."

Yesterday the spokesman for the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS], Mr. Mikhail Nedelchev, told the press that Prime Minister Filip Dimitrov, who is also leader of the SDS, briefed the National Coordinating Council on the meeting of February 24. A well-informed source from the SDS who spoke on condition of anonymity said that materials discrediting the minister of foreign affairs, Stoyan Ganev, and Rights and Freedoms Movement [DPS] leader Ahmed Dogan had been presented at the meeting. The document is said to be a list of Foreign Ministry employees connected with the secret services, the intelligence in particular, which was allegedly turned over to Turkey. According to the source, there was no evidence whatsoever that could discredit Mr. Ganev.

The leader of the parliamentary SDS said on National Radio today that the plot was targeted against the SDS Government. It seeks to unseat the government and install a new coalition cabinet, he said.

The National Security Council, with the presidency, held an extraordinary meeting last night. The competent authorities are to check the sources and the authenticity of all information and documents related to this case. The findings are to be presented at another meeting of the council within a couple of days.

SDS Parliamentary Group Threatens Ban on BSP

AU2702140492 Sofia DEMOKRATSIYA in Bulgarian 20 Feb 92 pp 1, 2

[Declaration of the parliamentary group of the Union of Democratic Forces; place and date not given]

[Text] Dear friends. The communists in Bulgaria in the shape of the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] have decided that the time has come for the downfall of the legally elected state institutions, including the highest authority, namely parliament. In their opinion the time has come for revenge. This is because it is clear to everyone in Bulgaria that the Union of Democratic Forces [SDS] is implementing its election campaign platform, and the beginning of an end to the communist system is already a fact.

It is true that the communists have difficulty enduring the swift, radical, and qualitative legislation that parliament with its SDS and Rights and Freedoms Movement [DPS] majority has accomplished in just three months. The government is commencing structural and personnel changes. For the first time in half a century, a person has been appointed as chief prosecutor who has no ties with the communist mafia. The possibility that the whole nation has been waiting for is becoming a reality, that those responsible for the serious national catastrophe will be held answerable for it. We are also on the eve of adopting the two most essential laws that will put an end to communist rule—the land restoration law and the privatization law. By returning state property to the private sector and by attracting foreign investment many new jobs will be created, which will fundamentally resolve the question of unemployment that has arisen as a result of the incompetence of the communist government. Sufficient funds will be allocated for pensions and other social funds that will resolve the problems of the elderly and of the socially deprived. It is obvious that the SDS has not only the will but the capability to complete the change. In addition, after the victory of the parliamentary elections and local elections in almost every large and medium-sized town, the blue idea [reference to color of SDS] also achieved a victory in the presidential elections. There is no doubt that the SDS today is the main sociopolitical force in the country, supported by millions of people.

The communists in the shape of the BSP, some of them employees of the former State Security and of the present special services, as well as their new friends in the shape of Dertliev, Karakachanov, and Simeonov cannot come to terms with the SDS' determination and with the fact that the SDS will not give way and enter into collusion with the communists.

Helplessness in the face of change, and bitterness brought about by the fact that Bulgaria is showing a new face to Europe and the world and that the SDS is actually changing the system without force and with the enormous support of the population, is proving to be for the last time the true face of the Bulgarian communists. The face of people from a past time who in their death throes are trying to stir up fear and terror, and a lack of confidence in the change. However, this is only their own terror, the terror of primitive people who led Bulgaria into catastrophe, guilty people because they themselves know best how guilty they are.

As an intelligent, ruling political force aware of its responsibilities we gave the BSP the opportunity to change. Its conduct over the recent days yet again shows that it cannot change and if its appeals for the downfall of the legally elected state institutions continue we are firmly resolved to take all legal measures that can be exercised against a terrorist organization, including banning it.

The SDS will resolutely and uncompromisingly follow the road of the reform. We will not betray our millions of voters. We believe in them as they do in us.

BSP Ability To Incite Nationalism Viewed

AU2702132892 Sofia PODKREPA in Bulgarian 21 Feb 92 p 5

[Article by correspondent Plamen Asenov: "Is Nationalism Really Disappearing?"]

[Text] It is perhaps overhasty to categorically assert that there are signs that the crude Bulgarian nationalism that we have seen since the winter of 1990 has begun to exhaust its possibilities of influencing Bulgarian political life. It relied on ignorance, fear of change, and, generally speaking, pathetic personal ambitions encouraged by the waning Communist Party.

However, what is remarkable is the following. The more the influence of the Communists decreased, the fewer people took part in nationalistic manifestations. This trend started to be noticed relatively slightly, when Zhelev became president in 1990, but emerged more clearly in 1991, after the Popov administration had begun to function. At that time a senior police official in Kurdzhali noted that the nationalists were particularly active on the first occasion that an issue was raised, whether it concerned Turkish names, language, or something else. However, if a decision on the issue was delayed for some time, their reaction on the next occasion was much weaker and more disorganized.

Whereas during the first half of 1990 Mincho Minchev was able to draw a crowd of at least 10,000 at a rally in Kurdzhali on any day and at any time, lately barely a thousand people will turn out to applaud him, and even they have to be cajoled into doing so.

It appears that all this is not only because of the general trend for the population to keep away from displays of political passions. Many of the people who took part in nationalistic actions perhaps sincerely believed that they were defending some sort of national interests, but they gradually came to realize that their sincerity was being unscrupulously utilized to promote crude personal and party interests. Another big group of people kept away because they sensed the lack of any meaningful theoretical basis that might motivate their actions. If one adds to these the people who always try to get on well with authority and keep their heads down, one may expect that during the next few years the nationalist parties and organizations will be pushed into the fringes of political life.

However, what I have already stated does not mean that now, when the Communists no longer hold any real lever of power, they cannot utilize the services of their nationalist subsidiary "companies." They proved during the presidential elections that they are still able to manipulate this section of the electorate very well.

In the main, the Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] influences these people through its intact middle-ranking nomenklatura, which lately has been increasingly switching from direct actions to various forms of manipulation. This is precisely one of the big problems at the moment in regions like Kurdzhali, where, because of the more complex configuration of the political forces, this nomenklatura has retained its ability to exert influence in both the economic and political fields.

Agricultural Production, Livestock Decline in 1991

AU2702131592 Sofia DUMA in Bulgarian 24 Feb 92 p 2

[Petko Stamov report]

[Text] Figures issued by the National Statistics Institute show that in 1991 the numbers of farm animals and poultry decreased for the first time to an unforeseen extent. In beef farming, the sector in which it is most difficult to build up stock, the fall was 10 percent. Numbers of poultry decreased by 22 percent, and pigs declined by 25 percent.

A comparative table covering 10-year periods shows that the present size of the dairy herds—545,000 cows—is far below the peak figure of 670,000 reached in 1976, and is approaching the 1940 level of 545,000. Although there are now four times as many pigs as in 1940, if they continue to decrease by half a million each year, their numbers will soon decline from the present 3 million to the 807,000 recorded in 1940.

The increase in livestock numbers on private farms cannot make up for the fall in the numbers kept on public farms. This is the reason for the decline in output. As compared with 1990, milk production fell by 16 percent, 23 percent fewer eggs were produced, and the total live weight of animals slaughtered for meat fell by 46 percent. Nevertheless, production per head of the population is still 2.5 to three times higher than in 1939.

Last year the Ministry of Agriculture completed an audit covering the last 10 years. The report stated that as a result of subjective weaknesses of a technological and organizational nature, in 1987 the number of cows was permitted to fall by 7,000, and the number of ewes—by 270,000, leading to a fall in production. Penalties were imposed on the persons responsible. However, the decline in numbers during 1991 was five times greater than in the case of cows, and one-and-a-half times greater in the case of ewes. So far, the competent organs (insofar as they exist) have not yet issued any findings regarding personal responsibility.

Dienstbier Interviewed on FRG Treaty Preparations

LD2702150392 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 1205 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Interview with Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier by correspondent Fritz Pfeiffer; place and date not given; Dienstbier remarks in Czech with superimposed German translation—recorded]

[Text] [Pfeiffer] Minister, a fairly long period of time has passed between the initialling and the signing of the [German-CSFR] treaty. Has this annoyed you?

[Dienstbier] It is a shame that it has taken half a year for us to be able to sign the treaty. For this half a year has given a boost to those who want to attack the treaty, and they are doing so diligently. This is very dangerous. It can trigger off a feeling of disinclination toward the Germans among the younger generations which no longer exists. The young generation often can not understand why their grandmothers' and grandfathers' attitudes toward the Germans are so hostile. Now people are beginning to become conscious of it again.

[Pfeiffer] The treaty is not only controversial in Germany, it is also controversial in Czechoslovakia. Criticisms have been made here of the fact that the treaty talks about vyhnani, that is to say, expulsion, and no longer as in the earlier treaty about odsun, namely, deportation. Do you believe that despite this criticism the treaty will be ratified in the federal parliament?

[Dienstbier] By the term expulsion, every expulsion is meant, be it the expulsion of the Czechs from the border area or the unjust expulsion of some Sudeten Germans. What is important is not the term expulsion. What is important is that it is said that the consequences of the war, the violence and the expulsion, must not be allowed to be avenged with new injustices. Both governments are committing themselves to this, and I see this as very positive, as proof of the fact that with our treaty we are thinking of cooperation in the future.

[Pfeiffer] Following Christian Social Union [CSU] pressure there will probably be an additional declaration made on the treaty in the Bundestag. Can you live with this?

[Dienstbier] I have spoken to Mr. Lambsdorff and Mr. Genscher about this, also with Mr. Rau and some CSU delegates, and I hope that no additional treaty or parliamentary resolution will direct itself against the spirit and letter of the treaty. I hope that this treaty will not be burdened with the arguments of the past. We too want to ensure the same achievement in our parliament.

The spirit of the treaty is cooperation, now and in the future. Politically it would be very bad if anything were to happen to alter this treaty or its spirit. A resolution cannot change it.

FRG's Kohl Arrives in Prague To Sign Treaty

Kohl, Havel Holds Preliminary Talks

LD2702123392 Prague Stanice Ceskoslovensko Radio Network in Czech 1130 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Excerpt] Following his arrival here today, FRG chancellor Helmut Kohl left to hold opening talks with Vaclav Havel at Lany Castle. Rudolf Erhart reports:

[Erhart] Shortly after 1030, the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany arrived here at Lany Castle from Ruzyne airport, where he was welcomed on Czechoslovak soil against the background of military honors by Czechoslovak Prime Minister Marian Calfa. He was met in the main hall by President Vaclav Havel. Both state officials exchanged cordial greetings and before posing for the ubiquitous television crews, photographers and journalists, President Havel managed to inform his special guest about the history and significance of Lany Castle for the Czechoslovak state.

Michael Zantovsky, the president's press spokesman, said that during their conversation in the Yellow Room both state officials touched on all the contentious issues connected with the preparation and signing of the new treaty. It will signed at the Prague Castle this afternoon. [passage omitted]

Kohl, Havel Sign CSFR-German Treaty

LD2702154192 Hamburg DPA in German 1503 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Prague (DPA)—Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and CSFR President Vaclav Havel signed the German-Czechoslovak Treaty on good-neighbourliness in the ornate Spanish Hall of Prague Castle today. This signifies that past history, which was characterized by occupation and expulsion, has formally been brought to a close, nearly 47 years after the end of the war. The treaty excludes the property demands made by the Sudeten Germans expelled from Czechoslovakia after the World War II, but grants the ethnic Germans living in the CSFR minority protection under the CSCE stipulations. The "expulsion" is also referred to as an "act of aggression" for the first time in the preamble.

Havel Addresses Signing Ceremony

LD2702162992 Prague Federal 1 Television Network in Czech 1502 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Speech by CSFR President Vaclav Havel at the CSFR-German treaty signing ceremony in Prague—live]

[Text] Mr. Chancellor, it is a great honor for me to sign this important treaty. It is great honor for me that I could sign it with you. I will be brief. It is the first treaty of democratic Czechoslovakia with united Germany. It is a treaty which should spell the beginning of a new era in the relations between our two countries, an era of understanding, mutual trust, and fruitful cooperation, an era

which will continue all the good brought about by 1,000 years of history of coexistence of our peoples in Central Europe and which will definitively bury all that is bad, which accompanied this coexistence in history.

I believe that this treaty opens before us an era of joint building of a united, democratic Europe. I hope that future generations will enjoy the conditions that we are trying to build at the moment, a component of which is this treaty of ours. I trust that by signing it we have contributed to the peaceful life of our peoples and, at the same time, to the peaceful and creative future of our continent.

Kohl Speech at Treaty Signing

LD2802000692 Prague Federal 1 Television Network in Czech 1457 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Speech by FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl at the signing of the German-Czechoslovak Treaty; Kohl speaks in German fading into Czech translation—live]

[Text] Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen: The treaty we have just signed on good-neighborliness and friendly cooperation is a step of fundamental importance in relations between our countries. We are taking this step in awareness of our joint responsibility, as neighbors in the center of Europe, for building this new Europe, a Europe of common values. This is what we set out in the treaty preamble. For us the treaty is on the one hand an expression of our relations of good-neighborliness over the centuries, and on the other hand a signpost for the future relations of coexistence between our peoples.

The treaty is based on the awareness that we can only shape the future together, and if we confront past history together. The treaty preamble therefore also addresses the chapters of history which were full of suffering. This treaty as a whole, ladies and gentlemen, is a testimony to our efforts for honest relations with one another.

The treaty is to be the foundation of our relations for the future, and in this spirit it encompasses all the important spheres of our coexistence—politics, the economy, science, technology, regional cooperation, environmental protection, transportation and communications, as well as culture, and not least, youth exchanges. There is already a lively exchange in all these spheres between our countries. In this sense, the treaty provides a framework and is a spur for further, improved cooperation.

Since overcoming the division of Europe, Mr. President, we have increasingly improved our relations in this brief period. The FRG government and the CFSR Government as well as the governments of the federal states on both sides are just as involved in this as the parliaments, parties, associations, and individuals.

Bavaria and Saxony on the one hand, Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia on the other side, are helping to shape these links in a very decisive way. These human contacts across borders are in line with our joint concept of coexistence in a future Europe.

Mr. President, the treaty which we have just signed emphasizes in particular the need for a rapid integration of the CSFR into a future Europe. In this way we want to make a joint contribution to the growing together of the eastern and western part of our continent. We agree that bringing the CSFR into the future European union is to our mutual advantage and we Germans want this. I would like to reiterate at this point that we, the Federal Republic of Germany, strongly support the CSFR's efforts to attain full membership in the foreseeable future. The CSFR can thus already prepare itself for rights and obligations of a member of the future European union.

I assume that the Czech and Slovak peoples do not merely support this membership of the European union for economic reasons but also, and above all, due to a desire to reestablish the historic, European identity of these people.

In the spirit of the new Europe, we are also addressing the issue of security, disarmament, and arms control. The new structures of security in Europe, as set out in the newly founded NATO Cooperation Council, provide important signals for the future for both of us. We regard regional cooperation as particularly important. In the border regions of Bohemia and Bavaria, the contiguous region has developed into a promising example of good-neighborliness. The people in these areas today regard this region as a natural continuation of earlier, centuries-old links. We also welcome the cooperation in the place where three countries, Germany, CSFR, and Poland meet. That is a positive initiative for the future.

The regulations on the question of minorities have particular significance. The treaty lays down the European standard for minority rights as expressed in the CSCE document on the human dimension. At the same time these rules are open and adaptable for future developments. They guarantee the Germans in the CSFR opportunities to develop on a broad basis.

I hope that these regulations will become a lively contribution to the mutual understanding and further reconciliation between our peoples. I particularly hope that my fellow countrymen, who after the war were expelled from their homes in the present-day CSFR, will be active in this reconciliation. Reconciliation must be our joint goal. In this process we must not conceal the painful chapter in our joint history.

The communist dictatorship prevented until recently any attempt at a forward-looking examination of the more recent history between our peoples. We will only have a future in peace and friendship if we examine the facts of our mutual history in an honest and sincere way—even if this is painful.

Setting up a joint historians' commission is an important decision on this path. Mr. President, you have described

the expulsion of the Germans as a profoundly immoral act. We are grateful to you for these frank words. We Germans know, and have not forgetten, that the expulsion of the Germans was preceded by the terrible injustice perpetrated by the German side against the Czech and Slovak people through the occupation and war of aggression.

We must neither suppress the committed injustice nor throw it into each others' face. We must confront our joint history and shape a better future with a clear grasp of past events. I am certain that the great majority of the expellees in Germany will also make their contribution to the cause of reconciliation.

Renunciation of revenge and retaliation is solemnly set out in the Charter of the German Expellees of 1950, that is to say 42 years ago. Both a love of one's native land and a European mentality are expressed in that same charter, which also states: We will put all our efforts into supporting a fresh start which is aimed at a the creation of a united Europe, in which nations can live without fear and compulsion.

The ties the expellees have with their old home also include the opportunity to take an active part in its development. The future of the CSFR, like the future of all of us, lies in a Europe of open borders. I therefore welcome your country conceding legal relaxations in the question of foreigners settling in the CSFR, with regard to the EC membership you want. The exchange of letters to the treaty contains a clear statement on this.

This step would, for both sides, be an anticipation of the opportunities that a united Europe would offer to all its inhabitants. Mr. President, critical questions have also been directed at our treaty by the Czech and Slovak public, and also at home in Germany. This is my answer: The treaty offers us a chance for the future. It is up to us, up to our generation, the Germans and the Czechs and Slovaks, to use this treaty to develop closer and more trusting relations between our peoples and our countries. This is a wonderful task, a rewarding task, particularly for our young people. Thus, we will fill our old neighborhood relations with new life.

All our partners and friends in Europe trust and hope that the Germans, Czechs and Slovaks, in the center of our continent, at the end of a century which has seen so much misery, deprivation, and suffering, will set an example for good-neighborliness and friendly cooperation in the new Europe. Let us take on this European challenge together.

Havel, Kohl Hold Joint News Conference

LD2702192592 Prague Stanice Ceskoslovensko Radio Network in Czech 1540 GMT 27 Feb 92

[News conference by CSFR President Vaclav Havel and German Chancellor Helmut Kohl with foreign and domestic correspondents in Prague; Kohl speaks in German fading into Czech translation—live]

[Excerpts] [Kohl] Dear ladies and gentlemen, before signing the treaty on good-neighborly relations and friendship between our countries I had an opportunity today to hold intensive and long talks with you, Mr. President. We exchanged our ideas. I can tell you something about a meeting with Prime Minister Calfa and his entourage.

The most important reason for my visit to Czechoslovakia today and tomorrow is to sign this treaty. The purpose of this treaty is that we wish to jointly participate in shaping our future. However, it is definitely not the case that we would like to forget the past, our history.

In the course of the last two years we have experienced Czechoslovakia's preparation for cooperating with Europe, its opening to Europe. You said, Mr. President, that we too—meaning Czechoslovakia—want to return to Europe. I would like to again assure you that the FRG and the federal government, and not least of all myself, are going to support you on this path. Our wish is that at a certain moment—and you will choose it and it also will also be determined by your country's economic development—you will join the EC and European union. We also want you to make full use of your associate membership during the transition period.

Article 10 of the treaty we have just signed outlines our obligation to help [words indistinct]. Today's talks have revealed that we have reached a full consensus about beginning anew on the basis of this treaty. We agreed, and I am honest in this, that there are open questions between our countries that we neither intend to push into the background nor can push into the background. What matters now is that we do everything possible to reveal a link between the matters included in this treaty.

I am well aware, Mr. President, what path your country will follow in the course of transforming its system into a market economy, as we have experienced this in our new federal lands. In the old Federal Republic we were capable of providing much more help and we continue to provide it. Nevertheless, it is in the common interest of all Europeans that Czechoslovakia follow a decisive course of action on this path to the future, that its relations intensify. I would like to point out above all the development of regions. In other words, I am sure that we have embarked on a good path.

I am also aware of protests that we have witnessed today. Not everyone understands this nowadays. This is a historic experience and a nation that is open to history always has to be prepared for reactions.

Nevertheless, allow me to conclude by saying that I come from the Palatine which is more or less on the French-German border and this means that it is a region that for 300 years has been, in a way, at loggerheads, but the struggle has gone on to arrive at friendship. A man has to have enough courage to begin friendship on a certain day, at a certain period. We are aware of the fact that this is the appeal of the end of this century. Whoever follows individuals' fate and their path of life, knows that in

truth there is no alternative. And this is true too in this sort of politics. That is why I, as the federal chancellor of the federal government on behalf of my republic and its citizens, declare here in this hall, in this castle, that I am in favor of this path to the future and I am sure this is a good path.

[Havel] I would like to thank Mr. Chancellor for what he just now said, as well as for what he said immediately after signing our treaty. From these public statements of his, as well as from our lengthy conversations, it has unequivocally ensued that both sides understand this moment as a truly historical moment, namely as the time when we are laying the foundations of future good-neighborly relations between our peoples, as the time when we are creating the future, when we are creating prerequisites for a fast entry by our country, Czechoslovakia, into the family of European people. Naturally, if we look into the future, and if future cooperation is the main contents of our treaty, then we cannot ignore the past.

We have tried, in the preamble, the introduction to this treaty, to express our joint will, our common determination, not to avoid the dark sides of our common history, to try to look them in the eye, to reflect them truthfully. It is not an easy process, it is not an easy process, especially under the conditions when for decades history was being distorted, when for decades various superstitions, various dogmas, various taboos were being cultivated and built, when history was being distorted. Nevertheless, some kind of a basic will to be reflective about history is a natural prerequisite for the work on a better future.

As to some things that are loosely connected with our recent common history, a sufficient number of question marks have emerged and these question marks have created a somewhat tense atmosphere surrounding the signing of this treaty, but I am absolutely convinced that in a few months, in a few years, this will play no role whatsoever and everybody will be pleased that this treaty was signed because they will realize the actual everyday results which emerge from the intention jointly to cooperate as two democratic countries in creating the new Europe.

The chancellor and I conducted long talks today. It was not our first conversation. We have talked many times about our mutual relations and we did not avoid any question, not even the question being discussed most frequently. We have agreed in saying that various problems can be solved, even those that seem unsolvable at the moment. One can solve them in an atmosphere of understanding, peace, respect toward one's partner, in an atmosphere of trust, one cannot solve them in an atmosphere of confrontation.

The preparation of the treaty was long, it was not simple and both sides were trying, as much as possible, to defend the legitimate interests of their peoples, their good future. Nevertheless, naturally, the treaty is the result of joint work, the work of both sides and it is what we could agree about at the moment. It is a prospective treaty which, according to my firm conviction, will turn out to be for the benefit of all our citizens. I consider particularly important that in the preamble of this treaty both sides are saying that various wrongs and injustices, which are contained in our history, cannot be put right by committing new wrongs and new injustices.

I think that today is a truly important day because two peoples, situated in the very center of Europe, the great united Germany and Czechoslovakia, two peoples, two states, which have exceptionally long common borders and an exceptionally long common history, are finding a way toward further good coexistence. I see in this a kind of building block for the future peaceful, secure, democratic Europe. It is in our country that European history got tangled and untangled. I believe that the time has come when in our our country it will untangle in a positive way.

[Unidentified correspondent, in German fading to Czech translation] [words indistinct] I would like to ask an important question concerning Sudeten Germans' demands to take part in privatization in Czechoslovakia, at auctions. Did you talk about this subject and has an agreement been reached?

[Kohl] You know that no agreement exists here. I already pointed out in my speech at the beginning of the news conference that a whole number of open questions exist here, and in that speech I also pointed out that we believe, and this is also supported by letters, that the possibility of foreigners being allowed to purchase property will be discussed during the course of Czechoslovakia's entry into the EC with the development of that community.

[CSTK correspondent] I have two questions. The first one is for the chancellor. I would like to ask whether the chancellor believes that contentious terms such as for instance borders or expulsion will be interpreted in the same way by both sides and whether the German side intends to discuss these open questions with Czechoslovakia? The second question is for President Havel, whether he thinks that the treaty signed can really help Czechoslovakia in its entry into Europe and whether the problem of the Sudeten German property will not complicate this entry?

[Kohl] First, on the subject of borders. We have used this expression in all treaties. This is in line with the German practice regarding treaties. That expression is used in the treaty with the Soviet Union as well as in the treaty with Poland and in effect the term border means nothing more than state borders and thereore there is no reason to conduct any semantic discussions. I can define the term expulsion simply: Expulsion for me is, in effect, compelling a man to leave his home against his will. This is very topical now in another part of Europe.

[Havel] I have no doubt that the treaty will help us on our path to Europe. Of course, it depends mostly on us.

It depends mostly on how quickly the political and constitutional system in our country is stabilized; how quickly and successfully the transforation of our economy proceeds. This of course depends on us. It depends on us how we are going to use the space that this treaty has opened before us. This space is big and I would even dare to say that the treaty is to a certain degree asymetrically in favor of Czechoslovakia because Germany has clearly declared its will to help Czechoslovakia not only in many social changes that our country is undergoing but also in the process of our country's integration into Europe and let us hope future entry into the EC.

As far as the demands by Sudeten Germans are concerned, it would appear to me that this question, which currently appears to be full of conflicts and drama, with the passing of time will loose its drama and conflicts, and it will depend precisely on how quickly we succeed in adopting European standards, in adapting our legal system to Europeran norms, how quickly we succeed in our endeavor to integrate ourselves within democratic Europe. I am convinced that development itself, provided it goes well and stably, will resolve many things and many questions that today seem to be full of conflicts and it will show that these questions are conflictless.

[Kohl] Mr. President, allow me to make a brief remark. For we Germans this treaty is an important milestone in the development of relations between Czechoslovakia and Germany. Ladies and gentlemen, for we Germans it is very important to contribute to the unification of Europe wherever it may be and we want to do this. We are lucky that Germany achieved its unity in October 1990 in peace without bloodshed and with the agreement of all our neighbors. We know that German unity will be very unstable and remain so if we do not reach the unification of the whole of Europe.

We do not want this Europe, which for us is an important prerequisite for the development of our nations, this Europe, to stop at the German-Czechoslovak border. We would like Prague, this ancient European capital of Czechs and Slovaks, to find its path to Europe, and we would like this to strengthen our old continent which is now experiencing a totally new dynamism. Within 10 months, and few people realize this, we will have a single market for people, for goods along with the EFTA countries. For 380 million people this, along with the United States, Canada, Korea, and Japan will be the most powerful economic factor in the world. We will not however rest satisfied for we also want a political union. We want the cultural dimension of Europe once again to be distinctive in the world, and we want to do this jointly.

I think that we have stood on far too many graves in this century and that far too many tears have been shed. It would be a pity if we failed to understand that the time has come to learn from history. This is also how I understand our offer to help your country to achieve association with the EC. I also hope that on the basis of the decision that you yourselves have to make you will at a certain point enter the EC. You rightly have said that the decisions must be made here. The level of your economy and all that belongs to it must correspondt to it. But we must help and we want to do it.

The future does not belong to those who look backward. The future belongs to those who know what the challenge of history means and here we do not want to destroy anything. We have to draw conclusions from this, and we hope that the children we saw beside those demonstrators a short while ago who were an average 50 years younger than the majority of the demonstrators, that these children when remembering this day will later say that those who signed the treaty recognized the sign of the times.

[RHEIN ZEITUNG correspondent, in German fading into Czech translation] Mr. President, how welcome are German investments in your country?

[Havel] The transformation of our economy, just like the transformation of other former centralized economies in post-communist countries urgently requires foreign investments. The speed of our economic transformation depends to a considerable degree on the confidence of foreign investors and on their courage to invest in our economy and our enterprises. The balance of foreign investments is not very high now. We are naturally interested in greater investments and we would be glad to see as many of them as possible. And I think that Germany can serve as a good example for other countries in this respect, because it is precisely the German investors whose fears of entering our environment are relatively lowest.

[Czechoslovak TV correspondent Zvara, in Slovak] Drafting this treaty required enormous work and numerous consultations and talks. Despite this, many polemics exist, both in Germany and in Czechoslovakia. What was the most difficult issue for you? This question is addressed to Mr. Chancellor and Mr. President alike. My second question concerns the date. Do you think that 27 February 1992 is the best date, or could certain delay of the date disadvantage one of the sides that contributed to this treaty? Thank you.

[Kohl] [passage omitted] I am aware that conjectures do exist in connection with the elections, or the event which should take place in June. I will try to give my backing to this treaty in the German parliament and my work will be directed at explaining that the principles of this treaty are very important. [passage omitted]

[Havel] As for the date the treaty is signed, then an earlier signing of the treaty was considered better for Czechoslovakia because of impending elections and because of various other factors. This was our own domestic policy interest. [passage omitted]

The talks on specific formulas, which concern in some way the past, were rather more complicated at times, but

what is important is the harmony of both sides that existed with regard to the entire main part of the treaty, its key content, or in other words with regard to the description of individual spheres of future cooperation.

[FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU correspondent, in German fading into Czech translation] My question is addressed to Chancellor Kohl and to Foreign Minister Genscher. Do you regard the additional resolution to the treaty, which is still to be ratified by the Bundestag, as necessary or as superfluous?

[Kohl] It depends on its text. If the text is sensible then it will be all right. And it is obvious that we will only adopt a sensible text. This goes for other treaties, too. [passage omitted]

[NEW YORK TIMES correspondent, in English fading into Czech translation] I have a question for President Havel. Germany refused to accept your proposal from May last year. It provided for Czechoslovakia facilitating the return of the Sudeten Germans who would like to take up Czechoslovak citizenship. In return you have asked Germany to declare that the Munich agreement was null and void right from the very beginning. As I have already said, Germany turned your proposal down. What will Czechoslovakia's response be now if some Sudeten Germans want to return and become citizens of your country?

[Havel] As for the talks you have hinted at, they were one in a series of various preliminary talks, when together with the chancellor, President Weizsaecker, and Foreign Minister Genscher we did a bit of thinking out loud, as it were, and sought various ways that could meet, to the best possible degree, the interests of both sides. These were preliminary political talks, the talks that accompany the negotiations of any treaty. I would certainly not describe the talks as if there existed a ready, well-considered, and fully drawn up offer not accepted by one side. [passage omitted]

As far as settling Sudeten Germans in Czechoslovakia is concerned, I feel that the speed with which Czechoslovakia will open itself up to Europe, the speed with which it will accede to various Euopean standards, the speed with which it will adjust its legal code to the legal code of the European Community will mark the speed which will open up an opportunity for any European—for a German and for a Sudeten German—to work, invest, and live in our country if he wants to.

[Deutsche Rundfunk correspondent] Do both statesmen think that the idea of a joint fund for the devastated Czechoslovak border areas is realistic? This is a fund that has to a certain extent been proposed by Sudeten Germans and whether this might meet their demands. [sentence as heard] There was talk about a highway that would link Nuremberg and Plzen and the like?

[Kohl] I am definitely in favor of intensifying regional development. A regional policy is a general issue and does not apply to Germany alone. I think that in 10 years time the European union will be formed very strongly by regions. This does not mean a rejection of central authorities. [passage omitted]

We Germans very urgently need such a development on the Oder between Poland and Germany, and I want very seriously, and so does the Bavarian Government, relations to develop well and exemplarily between Bavaria and the relevant regions on this side of the border. This also applies to Saxony and the adjoining areas in your country. [passage omitted]

[Havel] We, too, are of course interested in such an emerging regional cooperation. This is a matter that has been discussed a great deal and a number of things have been done in this regard. We naturally welcome any project which will contribute to improving the most devastated parts of our country and our border areas, any ecological projects, any projects which will lead toward the improvement of infrastructure, the transportation network, whatever form it takes since such matters are in our very best interests.

These are matters that are discussed intensively at various levels from the company level via republican ministries up to the federation and Czechoslovakia naturally attaches a great deal of importance to them.

[MLADA FRONTA DNES correspondent] I have a question for the federal chancellor. Since the federal government disagrees that the Munich agreement has been invalid right from the very beginning, then when does it think it was valid and what does it think ensues from it?

[Kohl] The federal government, just like Czechoslovakia, proceeds from the fact that the Munich agreement is null and void. But you yourselves know that legal consequences, especially for the Sudeten Germans' citizenship, are very considerable. They have arisen and they cannot be brushed aside. We concluded a treaty in Prague in 1973 and we agreed on a mutually acceptable wording, which has been included also in this treaty. I think that what could have been resolved has been resolved to the satisfaction of both sides. And those wishing for favorable development should accept what the two sides accepted here.

[AFP correspondent Meissner, in German fading into Czech translation] I would like to ask President Havel to voice his view on the rallies held in front of the castle today and also on various incidents targeted more or less against us.

[Havel] The rally held at Hradcany Square today did not appear to me as being especially big, important, or dramatic. It seemed to me as if it had a bit of a familiar atmosphere. However, I do not at all underrate these manifestations, I am trying to understand and analyze them. I think that on the whole I have formed a certain idea of what kind of forces contribute to this and what their reasons are. I could go on giving a lengthy lecture

on this topic, because numerous groups and interests play their role there. A most varied palette of various reasons also exists.

Kohl Thanks CSFR for Opening to East Germans

LD2702225392 Prague CSTK in English 2130 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Prague Feb 27 (CSTK)—German Chancellor Helmut Kohl this evening praised the people of Czechoslovakia for the sympathy they showed to East Germans fleeing the communist regime in autumn 1989, a landmark event in the sequence that brought down communists throughout the East Bloc more than two years ago. After Hungary opened its borders to East Germans looking to flee west in October 1989, Czechoslovakia followed suit, and East Germans seeking refuge on the grounds of the West German Embassy in Prague were spontaneously brought food and water by the population of Prague. In his speech at the ceremonial dinner following today's signing of the Czechoslovak-German friendship and cooperation treaty, Kohl said there was "much in common" between Germans and Czechs and Slovaks, "more joining us than dividing us."

"The culmination of the horrifying chapter (of Czechoslovak-German history)," President Vaclav Havel said, "were the horrors of the Second World War and the boundless suffering that Nazism inflicted on our nations." But the germ of suffering and evil propagated by Nazism ultimately affected its victims as well. "It was inauspiciously marked in the method by which our ancestors took revenge on Nazism," Havel said.

Kohl Meets With CSFR Parliamentarians

LD2702225892 Prague CSTK in English 2134 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Prague Feb 27 (CSTK)—German Chancellor Helmut Kohl met today with the chairmen of the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly's (parliament) two chambers in a ceremony in the parliament building. "I hope this parliament will find enough strength to ratify the treaty," said Milan Sutovec, chairman of the House of Nations. Chairman of the House of the People Rudolf Battek praised the Czechoslovak-German treaty signed earlier today, adding "no treaty, however, can replace living interpersonal relations."

The leading figure of the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party (CSSD) in parliament, Valtr Komarek, said that deputies from the CSSD would support ratification. However, he warned: "I don't want to dramatise the situation, but with time there will be problems" in the two countries economic relations.

"This Europe will not be a complete Europe unless it includes Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary," Kohl said.

Earlier today Kohl met with Prague's Catholic Archbishop Miloslav Vlk and Cardinal Frantisek Tomasek.

Havel, Kohl Review Goals at Gala Dinner

LD2802103592 Prague Stanice Ceskoslovensko Radio Network in Slovak 0800 GMT 28 Feb 92

[Text] The first day of FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl's visit to Czechoslovakia was wound up with a gala dinner, given in his honor at Prague Castle by President Vaclav Havel. In his speech the latter recalled that by signing the Czechoslovak-German treaty, the two countries made clear what path they wish to travel in the future. It is the path of participation in building a peaceful and democratic Europe and in the processes of European peace and unification.

Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl said that the treaty should not only consolidate the bilateral relations of the two countries, but that it also represents an important contribution toward a new and free Europe. He also emphasized that Germany supports Czechoslovakia's endeavor to win full membership in the European Community, and that it will be helping Czechoslovakia to achieve this goal.

The federal chancellor's agenda today includes a working breakfast with Federal Finance Minister Vaclav Klaus and receiving Czech Republic representatives Dagmar Buresova [Czech National Council chairwoman] and Petr Pithart [Czech prime minister]. After a gala farewell to President President Vaclav Havel, Helmut Kohl will fly to Bratislava, where he will meet Slovak Republic representatives Jan Carnogursky [Slovak prime minister] and Frantisek Miklosko [Slovak National Council chairman]. FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl's visit will end this afternoon.

2,000 Protest Treaty Signing

LD2802152792 Prague CSTK in English 1623 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Prague Feb 27 (CSTK)—About 2,000 people gathered in front of the Prague Castle today to protest the signing of the Czechoslovak-German friendship treaty. Chants of "Out with traitors", "Shame on the castle", and "Enough of Havel" encountered German Chancellor Helmut Kohl as he was entering the castle to be welcomed by President Vaclav Havel. Among the protesting crowd were smaller groups of people expressing sympathy with Helmut Kohl and supporting the signing of the treaty, but no violence occurred.

Dienstbier Discusses Treaty Signed With Russia

AU2602090692 Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak 19 Feb 92 pp 1, 3

[Interview with Minister of Foreign Affairs Jiri Dienstbier by Branislav Janik in Moscow on 18 February: "Roads to Stability and Trade"]

[Text] Yesterday in Moscow, Minister of Foreign Affairs Jiri Dienstbier and his Russian counterpart, Andrey

Kozyrev, initialed the first Czechoslovak-Russian treaty in the history of mutual relations. We asked him the following questions:

[Janik] What is the place and status of the former Soviet Union, or the emerging CIS, in Czechoslovak foreign policy?

[Dienstbier] You have the right idea when you refer to the emerging Commonwealth, in the framework of which the individual states are seeking their positions as independent states and, at the same time, components of the CIS. Of course, it is true only if the Commonwealth is viable and exists. For us, several aspects are important. The first is a purely economic one. The USSR was our largest market, and also a supplier of raw materials. We still need the raw materials, and we also need the CIS as a market for our goods—however, we cannot operate in the old way. The Commonwealth states are short of funds, and it is logical that with the little they have, they will ask for quality products, and they can choose. Today's talks included the well-known triangular trade mechanism. The CIS owes us almost $5 billion, and we cannot extend the credit any further. I will give you a specific example. In selected areas, where they cannot manage the harvest, we could help. We can offer experts, tankers to transport gas to combine harvesters, and the construction of silos for storing cereals. By dealing with this problem, we would like to introduce ourselves to a certain area of the market.

[Janik] Undoubtedly, another topic of interest to the Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry is the security issue. After all, the situation behind the eastern gates influences developments in Czechoslovakia....

[Dienstbier] If we had a zone of instability in the east, we would be in some danger. Among other things, it would require increased military spending. We are really interested in the reinforcement of democratic development in this region, and not only in the Russian Federation, where we spoke with Mr. Kozyrev.

[Janik] Can we, in any way, influence this development?

[Dienstbier] We cannot, of course, affect it all by ourselves. It is possible only within the framework of the Europe-wide process. The chief strategy for European security today is expanding the zone of democracy and prosperity as far east as possible. Today, even the West understands that its security depends, perhaps even more than before, on developments in this part of the world. It is much cheaper to focus on support for democratic conditions and economic reform in this region than to spend money on arms in case the iron curtain falls again—even if it were not in the form of totalitarian communism but, let us say, in the form of a nationalist dictatorship.

[Janik] The initialed treaty is more or less a copy of the Czechoslovak-Soviet treaty that was prepared a long time ago, but never signed.

[Dienstbier] That is correct. It was drafted as a treaty between the CSFR and the USSR. Since Russia is assuming the international succession of the former USSR in all the fundamental issues, it is now a Czechoslovak-Russian treaty. We will gradually sign treaties with all the CIS independent states.

[Janik] Earlier, we mentioned the possibility of influencing developments on this territory. Are you, minister, convinced that Russia today—with respect to its tradition, and bearing in mind that democracy there lasted only a few months in 1917—is not a time bomb?

[Dienstbier] Nobody knows. We cannot command history the way we once wanted to control wind and rain. The fact remains that the conditions for democratic development have been created here for the first time ever. Today the population is educated (while in 1917, it was 90 percent illiterate) and it is obvious that modern development cannot be based on quantity, but on quality.

[Janik] What do you mean?

[Dienstbier] Peter the Great had as many workers for the construction of St. Petersburg as he wanted. The same was true of Stalin building the Volga-Don Canal. It was simple, requiring merely the stroke of a pen, to make construction workers out of university professors, and they had to dig as long as they were physically able. To make computer experts out of construction workers, however, cannot be done overnight. If today's society is to be effective, it requires an entirely new economic, information, and political system. They know this in Russia now. The intellectual and educational prerequisites are here. They told me in the United States that they translate Soviet mathematical journals, but they have never seen a single Russian computer that is not shoddy. That is the paradox—they have the brains, but they cannot assemble a decent computer.

Georgia Delegation Discusses Expanding Cooperation

LD2702144292 Prague CSTK in English 2209 GMT 25 Feb 92

[Text] Prague Feb 25 (CSTK)—Georgia's Deputy Foreign Minister Tedo Japaridze has informed the Czechoslovak Foreign Ministry of his government's plans to expand Georgia's economic and political contacts with Europe. Yaparidze and a Georgian delegation were here on a working visit February 23 and 24.

Czechoslovak officials informed the Georgian delegation on the steps required for acceptance into the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). Czechoslovakia currently holds the CSCE chairmanship. Georgia was the only republic of the former Soviet Union not to be granted CSCE membership at a January

CSCE summit in Prague, as it did not submit an application. Russia inherited the seat of the former Soviet Union, and the Baltic states became CSCE members in 1991.

The delegation also discussed with Czechoslovak officials developments within Georgia and the goals of Georgia's foreign policy.

Slovak National Council Resolution on Milovy Treaty

AU2702132792 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 26 Feb 92 p 3

["DO" report: "Slovak National Council Resolution on Milovy"]

[Text] The Slovak National Council yesterday approved a resolution on talks on the draft treaty on the principles of the constitutional setup that was drawn up at Milovy. As this resolution was the most eagerly awaited decision of the current Slovak National Council meeting, we publish it in full:

The Slovak National Council *acknowledges* the Slovak National Council chairman's report on the Milovy talks and the decision of the Slovak National Council Presidium of 12 February 1992 not to approve the text of the draft treaty drawn up at Milovy.

The Slovak National Council *recommends* to the Slovak National Council clubs of deputies to submit their views on this draft to the Slovak National Council Presidium by 2 March 1992. The Slovak National Council Presidium will then compile a comprehensive report on comments that have been submitted.

The Slovak National Council is *turning* to the Czech National Council Presidium to compile an analogous report so that the presidiums can subsequently exchange them.

The Slovak National Council *recommends* to the Slovak National Council Presidium to meet with the Czech National Council Presidium as soon as possible and to jointly assess, in harmony with the Slovak National Council resolutions approved thus far and taking into consideration the views of the clubs of deputies, the possibility of concluding the treaty.

The Slovak National Council will *assess* the overall solution to the constitutional setup at its next meeting.

Poll Shows HZDS 'Likely Winner' for Jun Elections

LD2702144692 Prague CSTK in English 2246 GMT 25 Feb 92

[Text] Bratislava Feb 25 (CSTK)—The Movement for a Democratic Slovakia (HZDS), the strongest opposition force in Slovakia led by ex-premier Vladimir Meciar, is the most likely winner of the parliamentary elections, due in June, according to a poll conducted in Slovakia early this month. In the poll, conducted among 918 respondents by the Bratislava based Institute for Public Opinion Research, 38.1 per cent of the votes would go to the HZDS, 14.7 per cent to the Christian Democratic Movement (KDH), 14.5 per cent to the Democratic Left Party (SDL) and the Slovak National Party (SNS) would garner 14.2 per cent of the vote. In contrast to a poll conducted in January, the number of people intending to go to the polls slightly dropped. 64 per cent said they would vote, 21 per cent said they would not and 15 per cent were undecided.

Solon Kavan Wrongly Accused of StB Collaboration

AU2702124892 Prague CSTK in English 1628 GMT 25 Feb 92

[Text] Prague Feb 25 (CSTK)—The Czechoslovak Interior Ministry on Monday [24 February] issued a certificate, signed by Minister Jan Langos, acknowledging that Deputy Jan Kavan is not registered as a former secret police (StB) collaborator of any category.

In March 1991, Kavan, now Czechoslovak parliament deputy (Social Democratic Orientation), was found by a special parliamentary commission to have been in contact with the StB during his stay in Great Britain. He rejected the accusations and filed a suit against the Czechoslovak Interior Ministry. Kavan emigrated to Great Britain after the 1968 Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia. He was active in the student movement and later became the director of the Czechoslovak emigrant "Palach Press" publishers in London. He returned to Czechoslovakia after the November 1989 overthrow of the communist regime.

On January 26, the parliamentary commission insisted that Kavan was registered as an StB collaborator. Jan Vidim, member of the commission, today said the negative result of screening could have been caused by a technical error. "The commission and the Czechoslovak Interior Ministry have had the same sources at their disposal", said Vidim. He added he insists that Kavan is registered as a secret collaborator.

The Interior Ministry certificate confirming a negative result of the screening is not surprising, Kavan told CSTK today. Kavan appreciated the thorough study of his documents by relevant Interior Ministry bodies. "Professionals did not let themselves be misled by 'StB' terminology and by what evidently had confused some members of the November 17 commission," he said and voiced the conviction that various attacks against him and questioning of his twenty-year past will now stop. The commission, chaired by Deputy Jiri Ruml (originally Civic Forum and now independent) was set up in September 1990 to investigate the events of November 17, 1989 which led to the fall of the communist regime in Czechoslovakia. Kavan said he is concerned about the fact that on January 29 the commission insisted on its former verdict that he was an StB collaborator and that

its statement was publicly confirmed by Interior Minister Jan Langos. Kavan also said he is resolved to continue his suit against the Interior Ministry, and expects to be entirely rehabilitated by the court.

Intercepted Tanks for Syria Unloaded in Szczecin

LD2802132192 Prague CSTK in English 1914 GMT 26 Feb 92

[Text] Warsaw Feb 26 (CSTK)—Sixteen Czechoslovak T72 tanks that were prevented from reaching their destination in Syria aboard the German Godewind Ship are being unloaded from the ship in the Polish port of Szczecin today. The Godewind was intercepted by the German Naval Fleet in the Mediterranean on January 29 on grounds that the shipment was in violation of a law on arms export control banning transport of military materiel aboard German ships. The Godewind had to return to Szczecin.

The director of the Szczecin-based Intersped Forwarding Company, Josef Zvasta, told CSTK today that a shipment of another 15 Czechoslovak tanks from the past week is also in the port. He said all these Czechoslovak-made tanks might be loaded tomorrow by an unidentified Polish ship but it is not yet certain. The Czechoslovak-made tanks that were sent to Syria aboard the Danish Ship Nadia J. (kept in a Danish port at the beginning of February for some time but later allowed by the Danish Government to continue on its route to Syria) are supposed to have reached their destination but the report has not yet been confirmed, Zvasta said.

Intersped expects another shipment of Syria-bound tanks from Czechoslovakia to reach Szczecin March 6-7. Czechoslovak Foreign Trade Minister Josef Baksay said January 31 he had approved the export of 252 tanks to Syria in view of problems linked to the conversion of the arms production in Czechoslovakia which is causing high unemployment.

Sejm Continues Debate on Socioeconomic Policy

LD2802111292 Warsaw PAP in English 2324 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Warsaw, Feb. 27—Critical remarks prevailed in the debate that the Sejm continued Thursday over the government's socio-economic policy in 1992 presented by Prime Minister Jan Olszewski the day before. Critics of the programme considered it a set of general ideas and slogans of the wishful-thinking sort. Aleksander Hall of the Democratic Union blamed it for lack of emphasis on economic freedom and strict monetary policy. Deputies from the Democratic Left Alliance claimed that the programme was short-sighted, lacked strategic concept and departed from electoral promises of the parties making up the cabinet and from the prime minister's expose.

A majority of deputies, though, generally approved the idea of stimulating investments through a system of tax reductions and credits, and accepted the direction towards limiting consumer goods imports and promoting export production.

However, controversial opinions were voiced as to the tax system, interest rates and possible issue of money. It was recalled that by easing financial policy in autumn of 1990 the then government immediately ignited inflation while increased demand failed to improve productivity and quality.

Confederation for an Independent Poland deputy Andrzej Mazurkiewicz claimed the programme failed to name industries which were expected to pull the economy out of recession, while Wladyslaw Reichelt of the Liberal Democratic Congress said the proposed ways to overcome recession remind him of "applying a painkiller rather than treating the causes" of an illness.

The debate lasted till late evening. It is expected that the chamber will be addressed by a government representative and on Friday morning the deputies will vote to send the government's programme for further work to appropriate Sejm committee.

During the question time, Deputy Finance Minister Stefan Kawalec told the Chamber that following the agreement with the Paris Club of Poland's creditors on forgiving 50 percent of Polish debt, Poland signed appropriate bilateral agreements already with 13 states. Six foreign banks and two Polish ones with a foreign capital share and as many bank branches which started operating no later than at the end of last year have been exempted from turnover tax for three years in a move designed to encourage foreign banks to contribute to modernization of the Polish banking system, Kawalec said.

Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksander Krzyminski said international negotiations with the participation of the U.S. are being held on access of Polish trawlers to the fishing grounds in the international waters of the Bering Sea, and similar talks are to start early in March in Moscow on the Polish access to the fishing grounds of the Okhotsk Sea.

Asked about prospects for compensations for Poles wronged by the Third Reich, Secretary of State at the Ministry of Labour Aleksandra Wiktorow said that a Polish-German foundation of reconciliation was registered earlier this week with 500 million DM [Deutsch marks] paid to its account by the German Government.

Approves 1992 Socioeconomic Guidelines

LD2802112592 Warsaw Radio Warszawa Network in Polish 0852 GMT 28 Feb 92

[Sejm Speaker Mikolaj Kozakiewicz remarks on deputies voting on socioeconomic guidelines for 1992 at Sejm session in Warsaw—live]

[Text] [Kozakiewicz] We now move to the vote. I will remind you that Deputy Michal Cholonski has put forward, in the name of the Democratic Union Parliamentary Club a resolution for the rejection on the first reading of the socioeconomic policy guidelines for the year 1992. As this is the most far-reaching of the resolutions, we move to the vote on this resolution. Who of the deputies is for the adoption of the resolution on the rejection on the first reading of the socioeconomic policy guidelines for 1992? Please raise your hand and press your button. Who is against? Who has abstained?

There are 70 deputies voting for the rejection on the first reading of the socioeconomic guidelines, there were 215 against, and 25 abstained. I therefore declare that the resolution for the rejection on the first reading of the socioeconomic policy guidelines has been rejected.

May it please the House! The Sejm Presidium proposes that the Sejm send the socioconomic policy guidelines for the year 1992 to the Economic Policy, Budget and Finances Commission for consideration. If I do not hear to the contrary, I will assume that the Sejm has accepted the proposal of the Presidium. Thank you, I hear nothing to the contrary. [applause]

Walesa on Political Power, Ties With Moscow

PM2702143192 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Feb 92 p 5

[Interview with Polish President Lech Walesa by correspondent Viktor Shutkevich; date, place not given: "Lech Walesa: 'It Is Easier To Fight Than Govern the Country'"]

[Text] [Shutkevich] Mr. President, the first time I talked with you was in 1989, when you were still head of the Solidarity trade union. Are you not nostalgic for those days? What have you gained and what have you lost by becoming head of state?

[Walesa] Of course, I will always hanker after the days of my youth. It was tough, but romantic. The rendezvous, the meetings, the partings, the doubts, the betrayal... Let me tell you, sometimes I even miss being arrested. I gave my best years to the struggle. It was wonderful, and it will never happen again.

On becoming president I acquired, of course, the things that people notice first—better food, a suit, an office... But often people do not see how much I have to work. No one would want this job if he were given a taste of it. It was easier fighting than it is governing the country. I have lost many of the things other people have: being able to enjoy normal recreation and entertainment, have a beer on the grass... I dream of returning to a normal life. I want to be a good father, husband, lover, and electrician. But I am forced to be president, in order to build a new Poland, to propel our reforms.

[Shutkevich] How would you describe the present state of the Polish economy?

[Walesa] In the past I have compared our economy to a car. Under the old system things did turn and did work, and we did move, by and large. But we moved backward. While the rest of the world was speeding forward at the time. To catch it up we had to stop the car, change gear, and get going again. Obviously we were too quick off the mark, and we are having to pay for that now. But we did choose the right direction.

[Shutkevich] But 58 percent of Poles, GAZETA WYBORCZA announced recently, reckon the situation in the country is developing for the worse...

[Walesa] One of our mistakes when starting the reforms was to underestimate the need for dialogue with society, to fail to persuade the broad masses of workers at state enterprises of the need to support the changes that had begun. We are not talking to people about the important things—the size of the problems facing us, how much needs to be changed and converted. For instance, we used to make tanks and helicopters for the Warsaw Pact. Now that the pact is defunct, no one wants them. The plants cannot be rebuilt overnight, but people often failed to appreciate this.

You might criticize many people: president, government, and your journalist colleagues too. The press is in hot pursuit of sensations and writes mainly about all the shady goings-on—who stole what where, and so on. Sure it is interesting to read such things. But you do not build a country on that.

[Shutkevich] Your reforms are very closely followed in the CIS countries. Understandably: After all, Poland was the first to start paving the way from socialism to the market, pointing the way for the others. How applicable, do you think, is its experience to the former Soviet republics?

[Walesa] To be frank, it would have been much easier if the former Soviet Union and, indeed, the other postcommunist countries had taken the same path before us or, at least, with us. As for our specific situation... I remember when I was in Moscow to attend Academician Sakharov's funeral. I used another car metaphor. I am driving along a winding road in a Moskvich, you are driving a big container truck, with three trailers, what is more. Who will find it easier going? Me, of course.

Your problems are proportionate to your vast size, and also to how long you had the communist system. In your economy everything was so intertwined that the severing of economic links between the republics could result in a real tragedy. Let us suppose the same box of matches used to be made in three different places: One place supplied the brimstone, another the paper, and a third the wood. This had its own peculiar logic. But if all this was disrupted, then each of the three republics might be left without matches: Cooperation is too delicate a thing, and you cannot construct a sulfur production plant overnight... That is why I supported Gorbachev when he said: We are too dependent on one another, we cannot allow an economic breach to occur between the republics, or we will have a disaster on our hands. But that is what happened. People were so intoxicated with freedom and democracy that their economic reasoning was affected...

[Shutkevich] In your view, which of the Polish mistakes must we not repeat on the way to a market economy?

[Walesa] Unfortunately, I do not know enough about your republics to be able to offer any specific recommendations. You are the best placed to know what to do. But our experience suggests that extensive privatization must be speeded up, land must be given to the peasants, and more active support must be given to craftsmen, small businessmen, and so on. In other words, people must be given more opportunities to show what they are made of, to display initiative.

It is untrue that your country can afford mass employment, and the same goes for ours. We have twice as much work as this society can handle. But we are unable to organize it, to indicate where the unemployed can put their talents to use. A new system is emerging which they have not encountered before, so they are at a loss. Therefore, we have to lend money, provide vehicles, and so on. In your case and in ours the people are basically poor and they cannot get by without state aid.

[Shutkevich] And what about the Western aid the Poles were relying on only recently? When you addressed the Council of Europe delegates in Strasbourg recently you were highly critical of it...

[Walesa] Yes, there was a time when I had too much faith that the Western capitalist countries would come to our aid. We were more useful to the West as comrades in the struggle against communism than as business partners today. I do not think this position was farsighted.

When I spoke in Strasbourg I issued a warning: Do not repeat the same mistake in relation to the former republics of the Soviet Union. If they also have to go it alone on the same path, if plants close, if unemployment starts to grow, and so on, the West could have problems too. It should adopt a different approach, otherwise we all face the threat of chaos, rampant chauvinism and nationalism, disaster. Food deliveries are fine, but they are not enough. The independent states of the former Soviet Union have to be helped to swiftly organize modern production and convert production facilities. What does the West want? First and foremost, it wants to disarm you, of course. I too am in favor of disarmament, but, in doing so, let us develop industry and not throw people onto the streets. Given that kind of assistance, life will be safer for everyone.

[Shutkevich] In the meantime, Poland has decided to see to its own security, by moving some of its forces to the eastern border. What prompted that decision? Whom or what do you fear?

[Walesa] We are very concerned about whether we will now be able to find a common language, whether the feuds and misunderstandings will be resolved and not lead to a flood of refugees across our border. Of course, we have no intention of shooting these people. But we have to be prepared for the unexpected and we must control this flow, among whom there could be extremists and irresponsible elements. In order to avoid a repetition of the Yugoslav tragedy, we will need a force capable of maintaining order. We will have to provide these people with food and lodging in the first place and with further transport to the richer West. Once again I want to stress that we do not intend to pick a fight with anyone.

[Shutkevich] The other day there was a report in the papers that you had received an invitation from Russian President Boris Yeltsin to visit Moscow. Can we expect this visit to take place in the very near future?

[Walesa] I would very much like to go to Russia. I think life itself is urging us to cooperate more closely, above all in the economic sphere. Poland is currently arranging that kind of cooperation with Czechoslovakia and Hungary. What prevented us from developing it with you in the past was political barriers. Now they have been removed, but you have too many internal problems. But we are simply destined to pay more attention to one another. Warsaw will always be nearer to Moscow than to New York.

In short, our interest in you is great and constant. But my trip will require thorough thought and preparation. I am by nature the kind of man who always says what he thinks. So I have to mention the danger of dividing up nuclear weapons and that coproduction must not be destroyed... Many of your politicians may not like this. What would Ukraine, for example, say now if I were to say nice things to Russia? Most of all, I do not want to harm you in any way. From the bottom of my heart I wish you well and, as a neighbor, I want you to achieve stabilization as soon as possible. That is why I must not make the slightest mistake in this area.

On the other hand, you now have so many problems that their solution cannot be postponed for long. Incidentally, I believe that they should be discussed not only and not so much by the politicians Walesa and Yeltsin as by our ministers responsible for the economy, bankers, and enterprise directors... As for my visit to you, I believe it will take place soon.

Poll Shows Support for Government Policy Changes

AU2702132992 Poznan WPROST in Polish 23 Feb 92 p 10

[Boguslaw Mazur article: "A Time of Miracles"]

[Text] No one has any control over the development of the situation in Poland, say two-thirds of the people polled by the Public Opinion Research Center [CBOS]. Thirty-six percent of the respondents claim that the present administration is but a further step toward the country's collapse.

Although most respondents feel that there is increasing chaos, there is no sign of any climate in favor of radical actions. The respondents rejected ideas of dissolving parliament and holding new elections, introducing a "strong arm" government, calling a general strike, or leaving the country. The survey suggests that only 18 to 27 percent of the population supports radical action, and these radicals are confined to a few social groups, mostly young people. Thirty-six percent of the respondents aged up to 24 said they would like to emigrate, and one-third of those aged between 25 and 29 said they would like to see parliament dissolved and a general strike declared. Most of the respondents who expressed this view had vocational training only, felt dissatisfied with the authorities, and feared they might lose their jobs.

At the other extreme are those who would like to see the country governed by means of decrees. Over half of society considers that to be a panacea for the country's difficult situation. The CBOS surveys have revealed a clear connection between support for extraordinary government powers and satisfaction with Jan Olszewski's appointment as prime minister. Most of the respondents who shared this view were over the age of 40, with at least a secondary education, and living in urban areas.

The clear popularity of the "decree doctrine" can be attributed mainly to the popularity of Prime Minister Olszewski himself. In a January survey, 40 percent of respondents expressed their confidence in him, saying that they were happy he had been appointed prime minister. However, his government turned out to be less popular. Forty-one percent of the respondents said the new government was making them afraid that the situation would become even worse. This is understandable inasfar as the level of social pessimism has increased threefold in relation to January 1991.

What do those in favor of equipping the government with extraordinary powers expect it to achieve? Does the rejection of extraordinary powers signify acquiescence toward the path of reforms so far and a readiness to make further sacrifices?

Not at all. Sixty-one percent of society wants the Olszewski government to abandon the Balcerowicz program, and 63 percent has spoken out in favor of carrying out decommunization as quickly as possible. Only 25 percent of Poles support the Balcerowicz plan.

Therefore, according to CBOS surveys, a major part of, perhaps most of, society thinks it is possible to find a new way of reforming the country. Some of them think this should be a "Polish road" to capitalism, and others view it as a "third path" to a completely different system. So more and more people believe there are easier methods of restructuring the economy than the ones employed by the Mazowiecki and Bielecki governments.

At the same time, those opposed to the current reform concept see no need for radical action. They vest their hopes in the Olszewski government which, with its extraordinary powers, they believe should tidy up the country and perform an "economic miracle."

The trade unions are supposed to "keep an eye on" the government. Half of CBOS' respondents said they would like to see broader powers for the present government. And yet the other half said they wanted greater powers for Farmers Solidarity and Solidarity of Labor. They think the unions are supposed to assist in the harsh implementation by the government of the preelection promises it made. This means that Jan Olszewski has found himself caught between the hammer and the anvil. On the one hand, it is clear he has no intention of subjecting himself to the tutelage of the unions, and on the other hand he does not want to lose his voters. The present governing team has fallen into its own trap.

Spokeswoman Confirms General Elections in May

AU2702164492 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1552 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 27/2/1992—The local elections in Romania were held freely and fair, and they could be considered as a new step on the path of restructural reform of Romanian society, of building the state of law, Iolanda Staniloiu, spokeswoman of the Romanian Government, stated at the weekly press conference on Thursday, February 27. She emphasised that such an appreciation had also been made by foreign observers present on that occasion in Romania.

The spokeswoman also specified that the general image about the polls was darkened by certain negative aspects caused both by an imperfect election law and by the organisation and unfolding of the elections. The executive intends to make a study on all imperfections, ambiguities and errors of the legislative and organisational system, Mrs. Staniloiu informed. She said that for the organisation of the future elections the government intends to set up—as part of the local public administration department—an elections office, to elaborate a programme for the necessary technical infrastructure.

Admitting that a higher absenteeism registered during the second ballot than in the first one, Mrs. Staniloiu underscored that the government avoided to make any political appreciation to that end. She specified that the government was still determined to organise general elections in May, 1992.

She informed that the government had already debated a bill on the financing of the election campaign.

Electoral Commission Checks Fraud Claims

AU2702163892 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1333 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 27/2/1992—As many as 170 contestations and intimations were lodged with the Central Electoral Commission after the first round of local elections in Romania, the commission reports. Most of them refer to election fraud. Seventy answers to the respective contestations were sent to constituencies in the territory, requesting a rigorous check-up. A legal decision will be reached in this respect.

After February 23, when the second round of voting was held, and until February 27, 0800 hours GMT another 43 such contestations were registered. They were lodged by political parties and groups, national observers and a number of natural persons.

New Bucharest Mayor Halaicu Discusses Tasks

AU2702135692 Bucharest TINERETUL LIBER in Romanian 25 Feb 92 p 1

[Interview with Crin Halaicu, the new general mayor of Bucharest, by Iulian Costandache; place and date not given: "Ten Quick Answers by the New Bucharest Mayor, Mr. Crin Halaicu"]

[Text] [Costandache] Mr. Crin Halaicu, do you celebrate now that you have triumphed in the elections?

[Halaicu] Not at all, it would be petty. I have won, and I am pleased. That is all.

[Costandache] Nevertheless, I am referring to the last televised confrontation you had with your opponent, a confrontation that was not very gentle...

[Halaicu] He lost his balance, and that can happen. I cannot say that I really feel resentful toward him. As a matter of fact, that was not a confrontation between individuals but between political principles. Abuses do not represent arguments. The most promising idea has won, the idea that offers a new image to the future.

[Costandache] In what way has your opponent erred?

[Halaicu] He erred when he involved himself in politics. He is not made for it.

[Costandache] Have you been threatened? Are you afraid?

[Halaicu] I have received quite enough threats, but I am not afraid.

[Costandache] Do you consider this vote a great victory of democracy?

[Halaicu] Certainly. Let us hope that the Romanians have awakened. We will see the results later.

[Costandache] What are you going to do after you take the oath?

[Halaicu] As I have already said, I will ask to see all the mayoralty files.

[Costandache] Who will you rely on to help you with this task?

[Halaicu] All those who have ability and are competent. They will emerge soon.

[Costandache] What can you tell us about the Romanian Bank?

[Halaicu] We rely very much on this institution. Any mayoralty needs financial support. We will take credits from this bank to finish building blocks of flats and other necessary edifices. This is an absolutely necessary instrument that we are going to develop.

[Costandache] Mr. Halaicu, a difficult task is ahead of you. It is possible that many of those who voted for you will be disappointed. How are you going to please them?

[Halaicu] Time will solve this. I have never made hazardous promises, and nobody is expecting miracles. But there will be changes, and many of will be important changes.

[Costandache] Do you wish to add anything personal?

[Halaicu] I am not a Gypsy, as some people were saying about me.

[Costandache] Do we understand that there will be no... "gypsy quarter" at the mayoralty?

[Halaicu] There will be order and friendliness.

[Costandache] Then, we wish you success!

New Mayor To Investigate Abuses

AU2702180492 Bucharest CURIERUL NATIONAL in Romanian 25 Feb 92 p 1

[Ralu Filip report on statements by Crin Halaicu, the new general mayor of Bucharest: "The Results Will Not Be Seen the Next Day!"]

[Text] "This is a very important moment because for 52 years Bucharest has not had a general mayor elected through a free vote. On the other hand, the function of Bucharest general mayor is one of the most important positions in this country and the fact that a person who belongs to the opposition has been elected proves that our country is advancing toward democracy. Likewise, the fact that a liberal is now the mayor will ensure greater credibility in the West, because it means that there has been a turning point in the viewpoint of the Romanians.

"As far as the press information about repeated abuses that took place at the Bucharest Mayoralty are concerned, first we are going to examine them and if it is proved that what all we heard is true, we will take all the necessary legal measures and we will make everything public. It is high time for people to find out that we did not want to have power for the sake of power but in order to use it as a means of finding solutions to the general problems of the people. We will start implementing solutions proposed during the electoral campaign as soon as possible. But it should also be known that the results will not be seen the day after we appear in the town hall. We hope that the changes we want to carry out will be felt increasingly by all Bucharest residents."

Roman Interviewed on FSN, Election Issues

AU2702181892 Bucharest AZI in Romanian 25 Feb 92 p 3

[Interview with National Salvation Front leader Petre Roman by Corina Cretu; place and date not given: "The Lesson Taught by the Elections"]

[Text] Mr. Petre Roman cast his vote at 1800 by walking to the polling station with his daughter Oana. The opportunity to talk with the national leader of the National Salvation Front [FSN] was not missed, especially by the opposition press and the SOTI "Independent" television station. Now and then, the AZI newspaper succeeded in asking a few questions.

[Cretu] With what thoughts have you come to the polls?

[Roman] With the desire to win in this second poll as well, although this time we do not have the situation we had on 20 May [1990]—and maybe we can also explain why this is so. I am convinced that Mr. Cazimir Ionescu would be a very good mayor. I am sure of this. I know Mr. Ionescu very well and I know that he would be the first mayor to manage the Town Hall in a modern and civilized way, the way we want it, namely in the interests of the citizens and not to be in the limelight.

[Cretu] Should Mr. Cazimir Ionescu not win, how would you interpret this? As a defeat of the Front?

[Roman] Should this happen by chance, we would have to admit that we have been defeated. This is what you were asking, weren't you? However, the interpretation of the results has to be done objectively, very concretely, in order to find out exactly why this happened. As you well know, we have started an examination and we have already arrived at certain conclusions, which, I think, are true and valid conclusions. However, we have to finish this examination, so that this defeat will not be repeated.

[Cretu] Consequently, what should the Front do from now on?

[Roman] We have to draw conclusions from these elections and to come forward with what we have promised: a national program for a national policy aimed at capitalizing on what is available in order to give the economy a chance, because our well-being depends on the economy.

[Cretu] What is the next important event for the Front?

[Roman] The general elections.

[Cretu] But there is something else before that: the National Convention.

[Roman] Yes, but the prospects are the same. The convention in March has to take us to our victory in the general elections...

In conclusion, Mr. Petre Roman was asked what he thinks about page 8 of the AZI newspaper of 22 February, because Mr. Campeanu wants to take us to court. His answer was: "This is Mr. Radu Campeanu's right. However, were I to interpret what appeared in the opposition newspapers about the Front, today we would be involved in an endless series of lawsuits."

UDMR To Continue in Democratic Convention

AU2702092192 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 0829 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES, 27/2/1992—In a news conference held at the Bucharest head office of the Democratic Union of Hungarians in Romania [UDMR], Deputy Jozsef Csapo, member of the UDMR Presidium and spokesman, referred to the local election returns, saying that in some counties there had been "a campaign of brow beating directed against the UDMR candidates and even against the Democratic Convention to which the UDMR belongs." He termed that situation "as a token of social and political uncertainty, as ethnic problems were involved in the electoral struggle."

Asked by ROMPRES about the UDMR strategy in the coming general elections, Jozsef Csapo said: "We have no reason to question our future presence in the Democratic Convention. As a matter of fact, our collaboration with the other parties has been fertile so far. We will endorse the most suitable strategy in keeping with the local interests".

Senator Ludovic Demeny, present at the news conference, stressed that "Transylvania is a province of Romania and it belongs to all inhabitants in this zone".

Election Results From Tulcea, Dolj Announced

AU2702200092

[Editorial Report] Bucharest Radio Romania Network in Romanian at 1400 and 1800 GMT on 27 February each carry 2-minute reports by Tudor Stanciu from the Central Electoral Commission on election results from Tulcea and Dolj Counties respectively.

In connection with the results from Tulcea County, Stanciu says that "in the 23 constituencies" the "mayoral positions were distributed as follows: National Salvation Front [FSN]—10; Agrarian Democratic Party of Romania [PDAR]—six; Democratic Convention—two; and five independents.

Stanciu continues to say that in Dolj county "in the 55 constituencies where voters expressed their option on Sunday, 23 February, the mayoral mandates were won by the following political formations: FSN—36 mandates; Democratic Convention—four mandates; Democratic Leftist Union—two mandates; PDAR—two mandates; Romanian Democratic Party—one mandate; and 10 mandates went to independent candidates."

In conclusion, Stanciu adds that the runoff results from two counties are still outstanding, namely from Bihor and Satu Mare, as is "the protocol on the results of the second poll held in Bucharest on 23 February for the position of general mayor of Bucharest."

More Polls Scheduled for 1, 8 Mar, 19 Apr

AU2802121792 Bucharest Radio Romania Network in Romanian 1100 GMT 28 Feb 92

[Tudor Stanciu report from Central Electoral Commission in Bucharest]

[Excerpt] Good morning, esteemed listeners. The Central Electoral Commission has received all protocols from the constituencies where runoffs were held on 23 February.

Based on the verification of these protocols, we are able to inform you that on Sunday, 1 March, the second round of elections will be held in 12 constituencies in such counties as Mehedinti, Olt, Giurgiu, Vrancea, Satu Mare, Gorj, and Iasi, and the municipalities of Drobeta-Turnu Severin and Slatina.

Another seven constituencies in Maramures and Arges Counties will organize the second poll on 8 March, while 29 constituencies in such counties as Harghita, Mures, Neamt, Olt, Vaslui, Maramures, Bihor, Botosani, Caras-Severin, Cluj, Constanta, Galati, Gorj, and Iasi will organize elections on 19 April. [passage omitted]

Official on Hungarian Defense Minister's Visit

AU2702091492 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1954 GMT 26 Feb 92

[Text] Bucharest ROMPRES 26/2/1992—Asked at a news conference whether the Foreign Affairs Ministry did not give too big a scope to the statements made by the Hungarian Defence Minister Lajos Fur at the rally recently held in Miskolc, Gheorghe Tinca, undersecretary of state at the Foreign Ministry, showed that the Romanian reaction materialized in the Foreign Ministry communique of February 21 1992 was meant to convey to the Hungarian side a message according to which any official statement acquires a serious connotation. He quoted in that context Romanian Premier Theodor Stolojan who said: These problems are not to be trifled with. Even if they are routine reactions they should be there, Mr. Tinca added.

Next Mr. Tinca admitted he did not know the date of Mr. Fur's arrival in Romania the visit estimated to take place this week being postponed. Referring to this visit the Romanian diplomat stressed that it had not been announced that Mr. Fur would reconsider his intention to visit Romania.

International

Hungarian Policy Against Serbia Attacked

92BA0527A Belgrade NARODNA ARMIJA in Serbo-Croatian 13 Feb 92 p 53

[Article by Timomir Stojanovic: "The Open Rebellious Policy of Hungary: The Resurrected Evil Spirit of Horti"]

[Text] The anti-Slovene and anti-Serbian policy of Hungary in which President Antal and Minister of Foreign Affairs Jesenski excel; Their All-Round Helper Is the "Vojvodina Horti"—Andras Agoston.

Yugoslavia, especially Serbia, for the third time in this century is facing the unheard-of hostility of official Hungary. This first occurred in World War I, when the Hungarian band of soldiers committed unprecedented crimes against civilians in Macva and Podrinj.

Before World War II, neighboring Hungary opened camps in Janka-Pusta and Nadjkanjiza for the training of Croatian rebels. In World War II, inspired by hatred of its southern neighbor, and assisted by the forces of Osolina, Hungary occupied Backa, Baranja, Medjumurje, and Prekomurje, which it quickly annexed. There Hungarian occupying troops committed numerous crimes and mass murders, as well as persecutions of the Slovene population. Especially in Backa.

The crimes are best illustrated by the fact that the Hungarian occupying troops entered Novi Sad in April 1941, and on 15 April the occupier killed 750 citizens in that city (primarily Serbs). On the raid of 31 [as published] to 23 January 1942, Horti's criminals killed about 1,000 Serbs in the same city, in the most brutal possible manner, throwing many people under the ice of the Danube alive. They also committed insane crimes in other places in Backa.

Open Territorial Pretensions

Offering a hand of friendship and cooperation, Yugoslavia forgave Hungary for its crimes after the war, as well as war damage amounting to 1.4 billion dollars. After the Resolution of the evil Informbiro, Hungary excelled in pressures against and a blockade of Yugoslavia. On the border of our country, it carried out daily provocations and pressures.

Neighboring Hungary entered the current Yugoslav crisis underhandedly, together with the ruffians of our country. It first began to arm paramilitary units (Ustashi) in Croatia. The Hungarian Government did this, although it has long denied it in keeping with an old custom. With the beginning of armed clashes in Croatia, it opened up its borders to Croatian Ustashi forces. For the training, consolidation, and organization of Ustashi, it opened camps in a number of places—in Mohac, Marijadjub.... It converted the Hotel Liget in Budapest into a headquarters for Ustashi forces. For Hungarian deserters from Vojvodina, camps were opened in Segedin and some other villages in the vicinity. Ustashi are coming from the world into Hungary; after brief training, they are sent into Croatia and especially into liberated Serbian areas—Slavonija, Baranja, and western Srem. Therefore, history is being repeated.

The Hungarian minister of foreign affairs, Geza Jesenski, a man in the spirit of the German-Hungarian anti-Yugoslav campaign, and especially the anti-Serbian campaign, has brutally stated territorial pretensions toward Serbia publicly, first at the Congress of European Security and last week at the first summit of the UN Security Council (31 January), seeking that the "blue helmets" be sent into Vojvodina in order to assure its "complete autonomy," under the pretext that Hungarians be protected from Serbs. This is literally what Miklos Horti said at another "summit" of satellites—Hungary and Bulgaria with the monster of the 20th century, Hitler.

President of the Government Antal and Minister Jesenski, abetted and encouraged by the support of old Serb-haters from Bonn and Vienna, have reincarnated the spirit of the evil Miklos Horti, a fascist and a war criminal, who made a "Great Hungary" half a century ago out of Vojvodina, Baranja, Medjumurje, and Prekomurje and sowed death and destruction in the cities, especially in Backa, killing a thousand Serbs in one day in the most brutal manner.

What the Role of the "Vojvodina Horti" Is Like

The vultures from Pest and their "Vojvodina Horti," Agoston, foresee the imminent death of Yugoslavia, are analyzing the difficulties in which Serbs find themselves, and think that now is the right moment for them, with the help of Bonn and Vienna, to take what they can from Serbia. They think that they have earned it too, since from the beginning of the Yugoslav crisis they have first transported weapons illegally into Ustashi Croatia, opened up camps for the training and consolidation of Ustashi units, transported weapons and Ustashi with their agricultural aircraft into Croatia, supported and cared for Hungarian military deserters from Vojvodina, and recently assembled and begun the training of Albanian terrorists (deserters from the JNA [Yugoslav People's Army] or arrivals from Kosovo). They have committed still more dirty tricks against Yugoslavia and Serbia, a country that has already forgiven their crimes twice.

Geza Jesenski and other Hungarian leaders, with the help of the parasite Agoston, have been carrying out anti-Serbian and anti-Yugoslav campaigns in the world.

In their hostility, they do not shrink from conceiving and inflicting new blows every day. The last is a threat to close the only Serbian outlet to the north.

Seamen from Serbia are being treated with unprecedented discrimination. On the international Danube River waterway, at the Mocar crossing point, passage is prohibited after 13 hours. A conscious violation of the

provisions of the Danube Convention. A seed of discord has also been sown between Vojvodina Hungarians and other nationalities in Vojvodina. Good neighborly and friendly relations have been spoiled.

The little "Vojvodina Horti" and his order-givers from Hungary have cunningly and perfidiously done everything to cool relations in Vojvodina, between Hungarians on the one hand and others on the other. They are doing everything, in the old Austro-Hungarian tradition and that of Miklos Horti, to convince their own people that danger from the Serbs is threatening them. Andras Agoston is especially conspicuous in all this.

Agoston runs around the wide world speaking ill of, accusing, and slandering Serbs and Serbia because of an alleged mortal threat to Hungarians in Vojvodina. We hope that he, and the world, know what kinds of rights the Hungarians have in Serbia (Yugoslavia). As a reminder, what national minority in which country has the opportunity for an education in their native language from primary school to university, TV and radio programs, daily and other newspapers, books, publishing houses, cultural-art societies. In a word, all the rights as, for example, Serbs. Let's ask Agoston, Antal, and Jesenski what rights are assured to the Serbian minority in Hungary, except for the "right" that there are fewer every day, that, with the benevolence of Hungarian policy, they are disappearing, judging from everything, and will disappear one day from Hungarian soil.

By all means, the Hungarian minority in Serbia and Yugoslavia should continue to be guaranteed all human and ethnic rights. The Serbian people, throughout the whole course of their history, have never judged a whole minority by their parasites and traitors. The Serbian homeland will continue to respect, appreciate, and value Hungarians as loyal and honorable people. Disloyal individuals and traitors should be prevented from their dishonorable deeds. It is clear to respected and loyal people that they have friends in the immediate neighborhood, that their homeland is Serbia (Yugoslavia), that Genscher, Mock, Jesenski, Antal, and Agoston are selling them fog," [quotes as published] and that they cannot be closer than the neighborhood of Serbs, Montenegrins, Russians, Ruthenians, Romanians, and members of another 20 nations and national minorities.

As to the territorial pretensions of Hungary toward Serbia and Yugoslavia, their officials should study modern history. It will teach them not to reach their hands out to Serbia.

Interrepublic

Croats, Bosnian Serbs Hold 'Secret Talk' in Graz

AU2702121992 Vienna DER STANDARD in German 27 Feb 92 p 1

["MUE" report: "Negotiations Between Serbs From Bosnia and Croats in Graz"]

[Text] Graz—The Styrian capital is now becoming a diplomatic turntable for settling the Yugoslavia conflict. Isolated and under strictest security measures, the top leaders of the Serbian Democratic Party of Bosnia met with representatives of the Croatian Government for a secret talk at Graz-Thalerhof Airport at 1400 on Wednesday [26 February].

Strict silence has been kept about the exact contents of the negotiations on neutral territory, which took place on the eve of the Bosnian referendum for independence. It has only been learned that participants in this meeting were Bosnia's Serbian leader Radovan Karadzic; Nitzda Koljevic, floor leader of the Serbian Democratic Party of Bosnia; and a close adviser of Croatia's President Franjo Tudjman. A leading man of Tudjman's security staff was also present.

The Styrian capital is intended to be a supply base of the UN troops in Croatia. Provincial Governor Josef Krainer and Graz Mayor Alfred Stingl have held first coordinating talks for preparing this task.

Federal

Arms Stored in Bar Port Become State Property

LD2702145392 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1312 GMT 26 Feb 92

[Text] Belgrade, Feb 26 (TANJUG)—Conditions now exist that 15,000 tonnes of foreign arms stored in the Yugoslav port of Bar become the property of the state of Yugoslavia, as director of the Yugoslav customs administration Radoslav Sekulovic told the Belgrade daily POLITIKA today. In mid-1991, when the war was raging in the secessionist Yugoslav Republic of Croatia, seven ships carrying 15,000 tonnes of arms and military equipment entered the port of Bar in Montenegro. The shipment, sent by a consignor from Cyprus, was loaded in Beirut.

According to some estimates, the arsenal could have suffice for a 100,000-strong army. However, it remained unknown whether a northern Adriatic port was its final destination. As no one appeared to claim the shipment after the storage deadline expired in late 1991, international conventions envisage that the shipment is to become the property of the country in which it is stored.

Survey Shows Domestic, Foreign Orders Growing

LD2802120592 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0746 GMT 28 Feb 92

[Text] Belgrade, February 28 (TANJUG)—The growing number of domestic and foreign orders in the Yugoslav industry forecast the possibility that the several-months-long drop in production could be alleviated during the coming months, on condition that the current cease-fire turns to peace.

This statement was made to TANJUG by Tomislav Milisavljevic, an expert at the Belgrade Institute for Market Research, and is based on results of a survey conducted among 360 firms in the Yugoslav Republics of Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia-Hercegovina and Macedonia. The survey shows signs that the interrupted business links in Yugoslavia's economic space are being set up again.

Domestic firms have an increased number of orders, both in the consumer goods and raw materials sectors. Foreign buyers have also shown greater interest for consumer goods and various equipment. In the event that this tendency continues, Milisavljevic believes that the drop in exports could be alleviated in the following months. Yugoslav firms exported 612 million dollars worth of goods in January this year, which is 29.9 percent less than for the same month last year.

Bosnia-Hercegovina

Izetbegovic Expects Majority for Independence

AU2802135992 Vienna Oesterreich Eins Radio Network in German 1100 GMT 28 Feb 92

[Interview with Alija Izetbegovic, president of the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina, by Ruediger Wischenbart in Sarajevo; date not given—recorded; Izetbegovic statements in Serbo-Croatian and English with superimposed German translation]

[Text] [Wischenbart] President Izetbegovic, are you actually still the president of all people in Bosnia and Hercegovina, that is, not only of the Muslims but also of the Croats and even the Serbs?

[Izetbegovic] I certainly do not expect Bosnia and Hercegovina to be split up in the future. I think that our referendum will now decide on the future of Bosnia and Hercegovina. It will settle all quarrels and clear up the situation. Afterwards, everything will be much simpler. I think that the majority of our citizens—at least the Muslim and the Croatian population, but also a certain part of the Serbian population—will vote for an independent state of Bosnia and Hercegovina.

[Wischenbart] However, your country has huge economic problems, Mr. President. Deliveries from Serbia have become almost impossible; the bridge that provided a link with Croatia in the north was recently blown up. Is is not likely that you will soon be facing considerable political upheaval as a result of the rapidly deteriorating economic situation?

[Izetbegovic] You are right. We are battling with serious difficulties, serious economic difficulties in Bosnia and Hercegovina. However, you can see from the headlines of the major dailies that no one is starving in Bosnia and Hercegovina, and nor will anyone starve in the future. We have food reserves that will last four to six months. However, we in Bosnia and Hercegovina have become the victims of the war in Croatia, against which we have always determinedly spoken out. We did not participate in this war. As you know, this was a war between Serbs and Croats. We called on our young men not to get involved in this war and they took heed.

However, we are certainly feeling the effects of the war. Our economic difficulties are a direct result. Our communication lines to Serbia and Croatia have been severed. Railroads and roads have been blocked. For a time, even the ports at the coast were blocked. However, I think that the worst is already over. As soon as the UN blue helmets arrive, they will first reestablish communication links. From my talks with Mr. Vance, I know that this will be the first task of the liaison officers who come here. As soon as this has been done, the situation will improve considerably.

[Wischenbart] As far as we can see, the Muslims are far more enterprising in new private economic activities in Bosnia and Hercegovina than Croats or Serbs. Is this impression correct? If so, might this not lead to new, internal competition later on and, in the end, even to some sort of envy on the part of the non-Muslim population, even though today the Muslims are often still the poorer people?

[Izetbegovic] I think that we Muslims might have a longer tradition in trade and in private enterprise. Sociological studies show that the Serbs were far more inclined toward the forms of socialist economy—large enterprises, bureaucracy, etc. They liked being employees, officers, and so on. We Muslims preferred the private sector.

[Wischenbart] President Izetbegovic, everyone here in Sarajevo is shocked at the large amounts of weapons that are hidden in private houses all over the country. How will you defuse this dangerous potential?

[Izetbegovic] It is true that mutual fear has led to the people here in Bosnia and Hercegovina arming and organizing themselves. After the state of Bosnia and Hercegovina has been recognized, we will solve this problem. It is no secret how something like that is done. We will call on our people to turn in their weapons. This will be very difficult and it will take a long time, but it will go hand in hand with the establishment of official armed units, that is, of militia and army in Bosnia and Hercegovina. We can guarantee the people's safety. Nevertheless, if you want to know, I do not expect a war in Bosnia and Hercegovina.

[Wischenbert] My last question: Can you rule out that you would accept formal help from Turkey, even if the situation continues to escalate? Turkish President Turgut Ozal has offered such support.

[Izetbegovic] We are trying to solve the problems of Bosnia and Hercegovina by political methods. By this we mean the talks under the aegis of the EC. This is the only way.

Party Leaders Assess 3d Round of Sarajevo Talks

AU2802113492 Sarajevo Radio Sarajevo Network in Serbo-Croatian 2100 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] The third round of talks on the future of Bosnia-Hercegovina was held today in the Konak villa in Sarajevo. Three-member delegations from the ruling parties took part, which were headed by Alija Izetbegovic [Party of Democratic Action], Radovan Karadzic [Serbian Democratic Party], and Mate Boban [Croatian Democratic Community]. Jose Cutilheiro was the negotiator from the EC. After spending the whole day in consultations, a news conference was held some time after 1800 GMT at which The participants in today's talks assessed that a certain amount of progress had been made but more meetings were needed to come to a final solution. Mumir Delibegovic has more details:

[Begin recording] [Delibegovic] There are different views on the settlement of the Bosnia-Hercegovina crisis and the state legal organization of this republic. This was the assessment made at the beginning of this evening's news conference by the Portuguese diplomat Jose Cutilheiro. This is the way in which he defined the role of the EC in resolving our problems:

[Cutilheiro speaking in English with simultaneous translation into Serbo-Croatian] .... for Bosnia-Hercegovina after independence within its existing borders is expressed in this will to help in these talks so that different peoples and everybody in the country can find their rights and their interests and their preoccupations duly protected in the future constitution, in the future arrangement that will follow from that constitution.

There is still a lot of work to do on the definition of the constituent units, on their articulation in the future Bosnia-Hercegovina, the contents, the geography.

[Delibegovic] Stressing that important progress had been made today, which admittedly was not great, Alija Izetbegovic assessed the third round of talks thus:

[Izetbegovic] There was not enough time left to specify some things. A [word indistinct] paper had been prepared in which regard it is not (?good) for reaching agreement on [word indistinct] formulations, but what is written on this paper, if we leave out what we did not agree with, represents good progress, in my opinion.

As Mr. Cutilheiro said, the paper cannot be published because [words indistinct] the support of all three parties. However, to judge by the course of the talks, by the agreement on some very important issues, I am optimistic that during some future meetings we will succeed in reaching a final agreement. The rest of the job is of course to determine the powers of these units, so-called units, (?constituent) units, constituent units of the future state. Of course, the progress that was made is important in my opinion because the so-called ethnic principle of organizing has been modified (?by introducing it) into other criteria and economic, geographic, transport, and other factors that will influence the look of these units of the three future regions. We have had regions so far [words indistinct] some changes, of course.

[Delibegovic] For Radovan Karadzic, these talks were encouraging because small steps are being made toward progress.

[Karadzic] The main concern of all the delegations is to secure full equality and prosperity for their people in conditions, in changed conditions, in conditions in which Yugoslavia is changed. All peoples have a minimum below which they cannot go and there are many things that have already been agreed and which do not obstruct each people in realizing their potential without hindrance from another people.

[Delibegovic] Mate Boban spoke in a similar way:

[Boban] We are well on the way to finally agreeing on all those important interests for every people in Bosnia-Hercegovina and for Bosnia-Hercegovina to remain within today's borders. In this sense, the principle that was stated after Lisbon has not been violated.

[Delibegovic] Apart from the three party leaders the delegations also contained Haris Silajdzic, Rusmir Mahmutcehajic, Momcilo Krajisnik, Nikola Koljevic, Iko Stanic, and Vlado Santic.

At the end of the conference, which was attended by a large number of domestic and foreign journalists, Alija Izetbegovic made the following appeal to Muslims as regards the terrorist attack on the Banja Luka mosque, (?Ferhadiu):

[Izetbegovic] Throughout its 450 years of history this has been the only occasion that it has been desecrated. I fear some kind of revenge. I fear that this is an attempt to provoke conflicts. I want to say that we are not condemning and blaming the Serbian people for this vandalistic attack, but some individual extremists. Moreover, the Muslim people should restrain themselves and not respond to similar things. Temples are sacred for us.

[Delibegovic] Responding to this, Radovan Karadzic added:

[Karadzic] I join the condemnation of the vandalistic act, but I cannot say that the extremists are from the Serbian people, but in any case I condemn every vandalism and I appeal to the Serbian people not to hinder the referendum since they are not taking part in the referendum because we need to win the political will of the people who will go to the polls. [end recording]

Bank Official Sees Republic Currency by 5 Mar

LD2702223492 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1307 GMT 26 Feb 92

[Text] Zenica, 26 Feb (TANJUG)—Besides its sovereignty and independence, which it will acquire with the referendum, Bosnia-Hercegovina will get its own currency by 5 March. This was stated by Alija Alihodzic,

manager of the Zenica Economic Bank, during a session of the Zenica municipal assembly. Alihodzic is a member of the executive committee of the Party of Democratic Action which is in power in this muncipality. In addition to imparting this piece of news, which the assembly councillors greeted with a tumultuous applause, Alihodzic also provided encouragement for them saying that his bank had enough money and foreign currency.

Bosnia's Croatian Rights Party Hold Conference

92BA0499C Zagreb VJESNIK in Serbo-Croatian 5 Feb 92 p 3

[Article by Andrea Latinovic: "Croatian Armed Forces: The Strongest Armed Force in Bosnia-Hercegovina"]

[Text] Representatives of the Croatian Rights Party [HSP] in Bosnia-Hercegovina favor a unified and sovereign Bosnia-Hercegovina because they believe it to be the first step toward the "natural and historical borders of Croatia."

"The HOS [Croatian Armed Forces] and the HSP in Bosnia-Hercegovina" is the name of a conference of interest to journalists held on Tuesday at the Starcevic house. Introduced as guests at the conference were Dr. Davor Perinovic, a member of the central committee of the Croatian Rights Party in Sarajevo and head of the HSP support group for Bosnia-Hercegovina, and Mladen Bosnjak, and HSP President Dobroslav Paraga turned the floor entirely over to him.

Conspiratorial Reasons

Perinovic familiarized the journalists present with the work of the HSP in Bosnia-Hercegovina, stating that the "establishment of the first branches began in January 1990." He said that the HSP has branches throughout Hercegovina, and that there were around 50,000 party members or sympathizers in the Upper Drina region alone. There are also many members in eastern Bosnia-Hercegovina, and the party has strong support also in Han-Pijesak, as well as in the center of the so-called Sarajevo Romanija Military District. Petrinovic stressed that the HSP also has many members in Sandzak, but he did not want to release more detailed information on this subject for "conspiratorial reasons."

In connection with the current political situation in the central republic of the former Yugoslavia, Perinovic stated that Bosnia is mountainous country. Many invaders have come to grief over it, and this will be the fate of the Greater Serbian and army occupiers. We are constantly being threatened with war in Bosnia-Hercegovina, but there will be no war there as long as the HOS are there, because they are prepared for war. Bosnians are constantly accused of being passive, but this is not the truth. Help was offered from Bosnia even during the war in Slovenia. Tudjman declined the help, and if we had stopped the aggressors the majority of Croatian lives would have been saved, according to Perinovic.

On the subject of the forthcoming referendum in Bosnia-Hercegovina, Perinovic said that the position of the HSP of Bosnia-Hercegovina is that Bosnia is indivisible. We want no cantonization or partition because even a large number of Serbs in Bosnia support indivisibility. The referendum must be held because it is a referendum on the integrity of Bosnia-Hercegovina. But in six months we want to hold another referendum, one in which the population will make it clear whether or not it wants to join Croatia. The HSP in Bosnia-Hercegovina is a factor in peace, not in war.

Paradzik a Martyr

The actions of the HOS and the HSP in Hercegovina were discussed by Mladen Bosnjak, party coordinator for this area. According to him, the headquarters of the HOS wartime support for Hercegovina is in Ljubuska, and the disposition of forces in Hercegovina is the same as in the memorable year 1941. Speaking of the late HSP President Ante Paradzik, whom he called "the greatest Croatian martyr after Cardinal Stepinac," and the recent arrest of Paraga, Bosnjak stated that it is not known how much longer this behavior will be tolerated in Hercegovina. HSP members in Bosnia-Hercegovina will carry on to the end. In the territory of Hercegovina HOS units are the strongest armed forces. We will not permit partition of Bosnia-Hercegovina. The Croatians in B-H will express themselves in the referendum, and recognition of Bosnia-Hercegovina as a sovereign nation will be regarded by them as the first step toward establishment of the natural and historical borders of Croatia.

A journalist asked about the relations between the HSP and HOS and the authorities in B-H. Bosnjak replied that the relations are good because the Croatian forces are the only regular troops and the strongest ones. Commenting on the resignation of Stjepan Kljuic as president of the Croatian Democratic Association for Bosnia-Hercegovina, Perinovic stated briefly that Kljuic had to resign because of pressure because he wanted a sovereign Bosnia-Hercegovina.

Croatia

Vekic Confirms 'Open Secret' on Departure

LD2702132192 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1146 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Zagreb, 27 Feb (TANJUG)—Following the open secret in Zagreb about Zvonimir Separovic's departure from the post of minister of foreign affairs of the Repubic of Croatia, another one has appeared, also referring to the top echelon of the Croatian authority. The transfer of Internal Affairs Minister Ivan Vekic to another post has been announced. According to various

statements and articles, Ivan Jarnjak, who already holds a high position in the Croatian police, will replace him.

The latest issue of Zagreb's weekly GLOBUS published an interview with Ivan Vekic, presenting him already as a former minister of internal affairs. The newspaper also claims that Vekic has been offered the position of public prosecutor.

Commenting on the open secret on his departure from the position, Ivan Vekic said in the GLOBUS interview that he had "learned about it partly from newspaper articles, partly from rumors." Now I can say, Vekic says, "that my departure is certain". However, Vekic adds that he learned about the possibility of his transfer to another position, first from inofficial sources, and afterwards he was "officially informed".

Replying to the question of whether the departure of the ministers of foreign and internal affairs will leave a mark on the Croatian political scene, Vekic assesses that a mark will be left. He then adds that the reasons for his and Separovic's departure "might not be the same," but that they "can be brought under a common denominator." "I think that these changes are rather dramatic, especially regarding their timing," Vekic concluded. He also said that he would probably not take the offered position, but would return to Osijek.

Sporadic Fighting Breaks Out in 'Crisis Zones'

LD2702203992 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1727 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Belgrade, Feb 24 [date as received] (TANJUG)—The night was marred by sporadic shooting in the crisis zones in Croatia, and the two sides accused each other of violating the cease-fire. The command of a Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) unit based in the area around Sid said today a group of Croatian saboteurs which had been infiltrated on February 21 in the area beween Sid and Vinkovci had been broken up. Two of the saboteurs were killed, and one escaped. Several foxholes containing food and arms caches believed to have been used by saboteurs have been discovered on the banks of the River Danube near the town of Ilok. Croatian radio, which is subject to state censorship, this morning said nothing about any clashes in the Vincovci area.

The command of the JNA's Second Operative Group for Hercegovina said today that Croatian forces had during the night on a number of occasions opened fire on army positions around Dubrovnik. The command said that the JNA had not returned fire and had sustained no casualties, and that the UN representatives had been informed about about the attacks. Croatian radio reported that during the night Croatian forces in the Sustjepan and Nuncijat areas had come under fire from JNA positions. The radio claimed that no response had been made to the attacks. Croatian radio also claimed that the centre of Osijek had come under artillery fire last night, and that the suburbs of Jug 2 [as received], Senjak and Donji Grad had been attacked with rockets fired from multiple launchers. Military sources did not confirm this morning the reports about the attacks on Osijek and its surroundings.

Statement Issued on Truce Violation in Drnis

LD2702234192 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2155 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Knin, Yugoslavia, Feb 27 (TANJUG)—Forces of the breakaway Yugoslav Republic of Croatia today again opened mortar fire on positions held by the Knin corps of the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) in the broader area of Drnis, the information service of the Knin corps says in a statement released this evening. The statement also says that the Knin corps did not respond to the provocation. The command of the Knin corps warns the other side one more time that its patience has been tried almost to the limit and that it will do everything to protect its units, the statement adds.

In another statement released earlier today, the command said that forces of breakaway Croatia had attacked JNA units four times last night and that the fire from Croatian positions from the direction of the village of Stankovci, about 15 kilometres southeast of Benkovac, had even endangered civilians. The incidents have been reported to the United Nations liaison officers, who have instructed the Croatian side to suspend all attacks, the statement said.

Problems With Citizenship Applications Detailed

92BA0528B Belgrade BORBA in Serbo-Croatian 10 Feb 92 p 7

[Article by T. Oluic: "People Without a Homeland"]

[Text] With the proclamation of the sovereign state of Croatia, many residents of Rijeka have become "foreigners" in this city; the registry office receives 800 applications daily for "birth certificates"; the fee of 20,000 dinars for acquiring Croatian citizenship has been suspended until July.

"I can barely live on a pension of 5,000 dinars, much less travel, so I do not need a passport. So why should I care about Croatian citizenship? Even if I had it, I would not give 20,000 dinars for a citizenship certificate," complained one Slovene woman who, after living in Rijeka for 40 years, has become a foreigner in the city in which she spent her entire working life.

Since the proclamation of the independent and sovereign state of Croatia, many residents of Rijeka have become "foreigners." There are long lines every day in front of the Registry Office and the Police Administration, where the popular "birth certificates" are issued. According to Zdenko Plese, the secretary of Rijeka's Secretariat for General Administration, the Registry Office receives 800 applications for citizenship daily, the same number that it once settled in nine months. To make matters worse, only 120,000 residents of Rijeka are registered in

the citizenship records at the Rijeka Registry Office, and so it turns out that almost half the residents of this city have to join in the search for a birth certificate: either in their place of birth, or their place of origin, or usually in the place of their parents' residence during the first postwar population census in Yugoslavia, in 1947. This legal provision, which did not change in spite of the frequent changes in the Law on Citizenship, introduced further nervousness among almost everyone born between 1947 and 1972—even among natives of Rijeka who were born under Italian rule or in the first postwar years when Rijeka, as Zone B, was under the Yugoslav Army's Military Administration.

While they will solve their problem relatively easily, however, citizens born in other "states," i.e., other republics of what is now already the former Yugoslavia, have been faced with a choice that is by no means easy: either abandoning their old homeland and everything that they have there (if they do), or living in Croatia as foreigners, which will probably be even more costly. As far as we know now, foreigners cannot buy the apartment they live in, even though they contributed money for housing construction like Croatian citizens. They cannot simply register a firm, and perhaps not even an automobile.

It is not known exactly how many "foreigners" there are in Rijeka. If the ethnic structure of the population can be an indicator, at least a quarter of Rijeka's residents are foreigners. It is hard to say how many of them will seek Croatian citizenship, but a rumor is circulating through the city that the police are checking the identity of those who have decided to become Croatian citizens. This is nothing new for the police. Since an opinion about future citizenship is usually sought from a neighbor, however, and in the atmosphere of general distrust the neighbors are not favorably inclined toward "newcomers," this presents the "foreigners" with new problems.

One of the biggest problems for the foreigners has been eliminated for the time being. The decision on a citizenship fee in the amount of 20,000 dinars has been suspended until July, but it is not known whether it will be paid later and how much it will be. It is also not known how many residents of Rijeka, like the Slovene woman at the beginning of this article, will keep their old citizenship. It seems that the best answer was given by another Rijeka foreigner when he said: "I was born in Belgrade, i.e., abroad, I graduated from college in Ljubljana, i.e., abroad, and I live in Rijeka, i.e., abroad. Where is my homeland?"

Montenegro

Bulatovic Says Border at Prevlaka 'Unsustainable'

LD2702163792 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1520 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Titograd, 27 Feb (TANJUG)—The administrative border between Montenegro and Croatia, drawn near Prevlaka, is absolutely unsustainable, the president of the Montenegrin Presidency, Momir Bulatovic, said today in Titograd. Yugoslavia simply must not let go of that peninsula, he said talking to journalists. "We have taken all the necessary steps to resolve this issue in a peaceful, political way. This problem has been presented to the EC commission for Yugoslavia, and the United Nations have been involved as well," Bulatovic stressed. "If worse comes to worst, there can be no peace if Montenegro and Yugoslavia do not realize their right to Prevlaka, which belong to them under all norms of international law," the president of the Presidency of Montenegro concluded.

Albanians Demand Investigation of 1945 Massacre

AU2702215492 Tirana Radio Tirana Network in Albanian 2100 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Leke Lulegjuraj, chairman of the Democratic Coalition of Montenegro, has sent to Montenegrin President Momir Bulatovic an open letter about the fascist massacre at Tivar [Bar] on 1 April 1945. Because the Montenegrin media did not publish this letter, Mr. Lulegjuraj turned to ATA for its publication. We here give a summary:

The regular mobilization of recruits and conscripts began in the newly liberated areas of Yugoslavia at the beginning of 1945. Their task was to complete the liberation of Yugoslavia. This serious duty was entrusted to the Yugoslav Fourth Army. For this reason, the Supreme Staff decided to complete the ranks of the Fourth Army with Albanian soldiers, recently mobilized in Kosovo. These were sent to Prizren on the basis of an agreement and were handed over to a Montenegrin (?unit), whose duty was to escort them to Tivar. However, as soon as they were handed over to their escorts, the Albanian soldiers found themselves in a very serious and unusual situation. They very quickly realized that they were in the hands of their sworn enemies, because, a few kilometers after the start of their journey, the first victims fell. The Montenegrin soldiers immediately began to kill them. As soon as they arrived in Tivar, hungry and thirsty, the Albanians were left on the beach between the sea on one side and the machine guns of the 10th Montenegrin Brigade on the other side.

From Tivar beach, they were taken to the courtyard of the tobacco factory. The doors were closed, and fire was opened immediately. Within a few minutes, 1,700 people were killed, or more than 4,000 Albanians according to some accounts. The wounded were killed with knives and other weapons. A very small number, 18 in all, succeeded in saving themselves from the massacre.

The letter concludes with a demand for the start of investigations, the opening of the archives, the exposure of those who organized and issued the orders for this unprecedented massacre, and a request for forgiveness from the Albanian people.

Serbia

Assembly Holds First Extraordinary Session 27 Feb

Bakocevic Opens Meeting

AU2702092492

[Editorial report] Belgrade Radio Beograd Network in Serbo-Croatian, together with Pristina Radio in Serbian, Montenegrin Radio, the Serbian Radio Network, and Knin Serbian Radio, at 0903 GMT on 27 February begin a live relay of the first extraordinary session of the Republic of Serbia Assembly in Belgrade at which President Slobodan Milosevic is expected to speak.

Assembly President Aleksandar Bakocevic opens the session and proposes a minute's silence to pay respects to those who have died in fighting since the last session. He says the session is attended by 201 deputies out of a total of 247. Borisav Jovic, Jugoslav Kostic, Sejdo Bajramovic and Serbian representatives in the SFRY Presidency are also at the session.

Slobodan Milosevic takes the floor and speaks about the war in Yugoslavia and the way in which the Republic of Serbia helped the Serbian people in Croatia first with food, clothes, money, and so on, then politically, and "finally, when all this was not enough, with arms too, above all through firm support and Serbia's obligations toward the Yugoslav People's Army in performing its constitutional function, but also with a large number of volunteers that Serbia sent to the front in Croatia."

Milosevic Addresses Assembly

AU2702105692 Belgrade Radio Beograd Network in Serbo-Croatian 0910 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Speech by Slobodan Milosevic, president of the Republic of Serbia, at the extraordinary session of the Serbian Assembly in Belgrade on 27 February—live]

[Text] Respected people's deputies, after several years of increasing interethnic friction and the media war in the last few years, the situation in Yugoslavia turned into an armed war last year. The forced and unilateral secession of first Slovenia and then Croatia, brought into question borders, sovereignty, and the violation of human rights, and led to armed conflicts and bloodshed.

After the victory of the radical right in the form of the Croatian Democratic Community in April of 1990, the Croatian authorities downgraded the Serbian people in Croatia to a second-rate nation. Serbs reacted to this vehemently, very quickly, and in an organized way.

The Republic of Serbia helped the Serbian people in that area, first materially, with money, food, clothing, medicines, and then politically, in Yugoslav and international institutions and with innumerable contacts with the Croatian leadership at all levels, and finally, when all this was not enough, with arms too, above all through firm support and Serbia's obligations toward the Yugoslav People's Army in performing its constitutional function, but also with a large number of volunteers that Serbia sent to the front in Croatia.

The international community did not remain indifferent to the war and events in Yugoslavia. The absence of accurate information in the world about the events in Yugoslavia, especially in Serbia, as well as the frequent absence of goodwill among some members of the international community, hit Serbia hard politically, morally, and economically.

Presenting Serbia as an aggressor was incorrect and unjust. It took a few months and a lot of effort to explain to the world and, above all, Europe that Serbia did not cause the war and that it does not want it. The situation in this respect is today much better. After all, the decision of the Security Council to send UN troops to the Serbian Krajinas shows the understanding and readiness of the international community to help the Serbian people.

Their arrival guarantees peace and facilitates negotiations as the political form of settling disputes. I think that the stand and the decision of the United Nations represents a great affirmation of the policy that Serbia has pursued in this sphere in the last few months.

Allow me therefore to express my satisfaction with the fact that the People's Assembly is commencing its work this year in the first working week since the adoption of the Security Council's decision, because the decision of the Security Council undoubtedly marks the beginning of the peaceful settlement of the Yugoslav crisis. Its significance will be evaluated in an appropriate way only after events have developed further, although one can already say with certainty now that this decision marked the end of the terror directed against the Serbian people in the Krajinas and that it is possible that this cessation of physical and political terror is final.

This fact illustrates best what would have been missed had Serbia not rejected the ultimatum of the EC on 5 November last year. Pointing to the fact that the settlement of the position and the rights of the Serbian people in Croatia is at the root of the Yugoslav crisis and the tragic war in Croatia, we said at that time, I quote, that it must finally be understood that the insistence on the Serbs in Krajinas remaining under the sovereignty of the Croatian authorities was devoid of any sense of reality and feeling of responsibility for the consequences of such a solution that did not take into account the continued genocide, and that we are firmly convinced that the solution that the conference on Yugoslavia should adopt can only be the solution with which the people who live there will agree.

Only then can this solution indeed be just and lasting. This solution renders necessary the control and the guarantee of the international community. I quoted in full the part of the speech with which we rejected the ultimatum four month ago. Today everyone can see to

what extent the Security Council's decision has essentially affirmed such an approach.

Therefore, the only thing left for those who criticized us at home for being obstinate and adventurous, telling us to accept everything in The Hague, is to continue to claim that there has never actually been any terror against Serbs in Croatia and that we invented all this in order to get hold of Croatian territory.

The assessment that we are at the beginning of the peace process is supported by the following facts: First, the arrival of the blue helmets is a matter of days. Second, the conference on Bosnia, which is continuing today, has started and, as we can see, has already made some progress. Third, in connection with the continuation of the conference in Brussels, the view on the equality of option on the continuity of Yugoslavia as the common state of those Yugoslav republics that want it is prevailing. And finally, fourth, a concrete agreement has been reached between the representatives of Serbia and Montenegro on the constitutional reconstruction of Yugoslavia.

All these facts illustrate the success of three constants in our policy since the beginning of the Yugoslav crisis. The first is the securing and protection of the political and physical integrity of the Serbian people who live outside the Republic of Serbia. The second is the continuity of Yugoslavia as the common state. And the third is the endeavor to find a peaceful way of settling the Yugoslav crisis, or our well-known stand that the Yugoslav crisis should be resolved through peace and not war.

By insisting on the continuity and legality of statehood and the international status [subjektivitet] of Yugoslavia, as well as on the equal and inalienable right of the people to self-determination, Serbia has in essence, on the one hand, been protecting the right of the Serbian people to live in a common state and, on the other, rejecting the unacceptable foreign interference in the organization of internal relations in our republic.

We think that the right of the people to leave Yugoslavia cannot be stronger than the right of the people to remain in Yugoslavia, and that no one can be kept in Yugoslavia against his will, just as no one can be taken out of Yugoslavia against his will.

Had we abandoned the Yugoslav option under pressure, we would automatically have placed Serbia in a secessionist position and made it very difficult, if not impossible, for the Serbian people who live in other republics successfully to protect their vital interests. It is quite certain that under such circumstances conditions would not have existed for their preservation, and especially for placing them under the protection of the United Nations, for the continuity of political negotiations, the start of the conference on Bosnia, and the entire spectrum of political actions on which the interest of the Serbian people's integrity have been affirmed.

The fact that from now on the freedom and safety of the Serbian people are protected by peace and not war demonstrates that the main aim of the liberation struggle in the Krajinas is being achieved. Therefore, what is being achieved is everything that Serbia wanted regarding the Serbian people in Croatia in helping them at the time when they were exposed to the terror of the Croatian authorities. Through these efforts, Serbia made its contribution directly, but also indirectly, through the internationalization of the question of the Serbian Krajinas and securing the protection of their life and interests by the international community.

I think that this is the greatest thing that has been achieved in the present circumstances, although it would understandably have been best if all this had not happened, if we had been able to avoid the war and if no human life had to be lost. We are greatly affected by the loss of any human life. For a people that has suffered so many victims throughout its history, every human life is a great sacrifice, but it is certain that with the victims who fell in the struggle against the state terror of the Croatian authorities, the Serbian people have been defended from an incomparably greater danger and that preconditions have been created for just peace.

The citizens of Serbia have extended general support to the establishment of peace. So, those who were mobilized to go the front will be able to return to their homes, families, and jobs. Serbia will finally be able to deal with its internal, above all, economic problems. Together, we, the republic and the people, will meet with understanding in both Europe and the world.

The settlement of the final status of the Krajinas, which will be achieved in the further negotiation process, cannot avoid taking into consideration the legitimate interests of the population in the Krajinas and their acceptance. We are firmly convinced therefore that the arrival of the blue helmets in the Serbian Krajinas opens up a pragmatic, realistic, and democratic way of resolving the key problem of the Yugoslav crisis.

Without disparaging the role of the EC, especially if this role were to return to the framework of the mandate given to it by the Yugoslav participants, the CSCE, and the Security Council of the United Nations, I would like to take this opportunity to express from this place our recognition of the efforts of the Security Council so far, and especially of Cyrus Vance, as well as to stress our interest in the further strengthening of not only the peace but also the political role of the United Nations in the negotiations to resolve the Yugoslav state-political crisis.

Despite the secessionist conditions that burdened our position at one time, the Yugoslav option has legitimized us from the long-term aspect as the proponents of the process of integration in Yugoslavia. On the other hand, it has become increasingly evident that the policy pursued by Serbia is in fact a synonym for stability in the Balkans, and that permanent stability and peace cannot

be secured to the detriment of Serbia and the legitimate interests of the Serbian people.

It has been acknowledged that the preservation of Yugoslavia, even in reduced form, could contribute more toward greater stability in the Balkans than its total disintegration. In this context, we have noted growing understanding for the preservation of the continuity and the international political and legal status of a rearranged Yugoslavia.

It is important that the political opening up of Europe toward the Yugoslav option temporally coincides with changes in the stand toward our republic and its policies. So, the crisis has begun to be settled—I stress has begun—because, although some positive tendencies toward Serbia have recently become apparent in Europe, one can still recognize the strategic direction of the actions of some politicians and some governments that are not inclined to Serbia, as well as pressure for direct or tacit support for this kind of policy of some European countries. This strategic direction against Serbia implies: First, the reduction of Serbia to the smallest possible territory; second, the neutralization of its military power by discrediting and, if possible, defeating the Yugoslav People's Army; third, the imposition and encouragement in Serbia of all the burdens of internal and outside pressure through the problems of Kosovo and internal political confrontation; fourth, the transformation of Serbia with this and various restrictions into a peripheral Balkan state without the power to influence its own fate and without the ability to resist pressure from outside.

In this context, the appearance of the policy of territorial revisionism by some neighboring countries is evident. This leads to the erosion of the territorial framework of the Versailles system confirmed by the Paris Peace Agreement.

Therefore, the preservation of the state continuity of Yugoslavia based on consent between Serbia and Montenegro on a common state is of enormous historical importance and facilitates not only the survival but also the successful development of our country, which has the central rather than a peripheral position in the Balkans, and represents an unavoidable bridge between Europe and the Near East, and has the necessary potential for a successful development.

Serbia is interested in Yugoslavia primarily because a large number of Serbs live outside Serbia, throughout Yugoslavia. Then, Serbia is in favor of Yugoslavia because this century it was the Serbian people who provided the greatest number of fighters and suffered the greatest number of victims for Yugoslavia. Today, when some peoples want to leave Yugoslavia, Serbia is ready to remain in the same community together with those who also want to stay in it and who do not want to leave Yugoslavia, being aware at the same time of the fact that such a reduced Yugoslavia is not the same as present-day Yugoslavia, but prepared to preserve the continuity of Yugoslavia with all those who want to in the same way, or at least in a similar way. In this sense, I hope that the readiness to remain in Yugoslavia expressed so far by Serbia and Montenegro will spread to some other Yugoslav republics.

The general trends and the policy that we have been conducting have improved the conditions for achieving the interests of Serbia and the Serbian people. Under the new circumstances that have evolved after the decision of the Security Council, the Serbian people in Krajinas are free and safe. They will take part in the talks and decisionmaking on their own position as equal partners.

In Bosnia-Hercegovina, in the existing conditions the Serbian people can be neither threatened nor separated against their will. Therefore, no one can deny our principled stand that we will respect any decision on Bosnia-Hercegovina based on consensus among the three constituent peoples. All this together in fact means that the conditions are ripe for the realization of the interests of Serbia, its citizens, and the Serbian people to be realistically based on peaceful political, economic, social, and cultural processes.

We therefore have a chance to make moves which, with their peaceful intentions and democratic character, will speed up many times the realization of our aims.

The policy of secession has shown itself, especially in Croatia, to be the source of extreme nationalism, intolerance, and serious political restrictions and pressure toward the Serbian people, and, at the end of the day, toward one's own people too. A totalitarian chauvinist regime does not have the conditions to provide economic and cultural prosperity.

In contrast to that, Serbia has clearly been affirming its loyalty to the policy of the best democratic traditions of tolerance and full national equality. This means: First, that in regulating the problems of the Yugoslav crisis we will use peaceful and internationally recognized instruments. Second, relying on the existing international mechanism, we will fight for the sections of the Serbian people outside Serbia to have their democratic right to self-determination fully recognized.

Third, we will strive for an agreement on a global solution to the future of Yugoslavia, which includes the questions of state continuity and succession, with prior settlement of contentious issues, rights and obligations, and which would create conditions, on the basis of reciprocity, to establish with our neighbors good-neighborly relations, cooperation without discrimination and restrictions—in accordance with the highest European standards—and a firmer and lasting form of association on Yugoslav territory depending on the extent to which an international agreement is reached in the work of the conference on Yugoslavia. Fourth, every one should continue to count on our firm commitment that, respecting the UN Charter, we do not consider war as the means of settling national and other interests, except in the case of self-defense.

Fifth, the problems in Kosovo—with regard to which we have been unjustly and constantly subjected to great external pressure—will be resolved in line with international norms on the rights of the members of ethnic minorities. These rights will not be reduced in the cases where they are greater than international norms. They cannot, however, be abused in order to destroy the integrity and weaken the system and power of the country.

Sixth, we will strive to associate with integrational and regional groupings in Europe and, in this framework, institutional cooperation will proceed with the EC and EFTA. We confirm our readiness to be accepted into the Council of Europe with the consistent application of the principles and aims that are defined in the CSCE documents.

Seventh, we will continue to actively participate in achieving the aims of the Nonaligned Movement in our capacity as a founding member.

I therefore think that very significant but as yet only incipient conditions for the settlement of the Yugoslav crisis have been created in which the interests of Serbia and the Serbian people will be protected and achieved on an equal footing with the interests of the other Yugoslav peoples. In the struggle for these interests, Serbia has in the last few years met with much resistance and criticism. It was claimed that this is a question of Serbian-Bolshevik-Communist resistance to democracy, of Serbian-unitarist-hegemonistic aims, of Serbian nationalism, and so on, even though during that time only the Serbian people were physically persecuted and destroyed, politically disenfranchised, and ethnically marginalized.

It can be said today that we have passed the most difficult part of the road to resolving the agony of our country and that conditions now exist for the peaceful and democratic resolution of the Yugoslav crisis. There is no doubt that Yugoslavia is the optimal solution for the national question of all Yugoslav peoples, particularly those that are mixed together. Guided by this perception, the Serbian people have on two occasions this century decided in favor of Yugoslavia as their state.

Yugoslavia is a state project which virtually ideally achieves the settlement of the Serbian national question because it gathers together most Serbs in one state. The Serbian people has therefore preferred Yugoslavia to an independent state of Serbia. Even today both in theoretical and practical terms, Yugoslavia is a better variant for resolving the Serbian national question. This is the reason that the Republic of Serbia has defended its preservation with such persistence.

The other possibility of an independent Serbia was a form of political existence of the Serbian people before the creation of Yugoslavia as the common state of the Yugoslav peoples. Even after this, it has always been an ever present possibility in the case of the disintegration of Yugoslavia. Its basic shortcoming is that as an independent state and as a federal unit in a federation, almost a third of the Serbian people remain outside its borders, thus failing to secure the appropriate support for achieving vital interests.

After the premature recognition of Slovenia and Croatia by some countries, there have been panic reactions to these events here and there in the public by some individuals and party leaderships and I would say that panic demands have even made for Serbia to be organized as an independent state. Instead of a reply to those who will rightly perceive that one must always be ready for this variant, which is indeed the worst variant, of us remaining alone, I would make use of a quote in order to show that two years ago in this hall, when we adopted the new and now valid Constitution of Serbia, we were aware of this possibility. I quote, I believe that with our endeavors and the endeavors of other republics and peoples who care about Yugoslavia, the Yugoslav federation in the existing or somewhat altered form will successfully overcome the crisis. It would, however, be irresponsible as regards Serbia and its citizens if, in the conditions of such strongly expressed disintegrational confederalist tendencies in some parts of the country, we enter the denouement of the Yugoslav crisis with only one orientation, that of a federal Yugoslavia or the exclusion of any possibility for the survival of Serbia. Therefore, this proposed constitution of Serbia has been prepared in consideration of the other possible option of Serbia as an independent state.

I wanted to remind... [changes thought] I have ended the quote. I wanted to remind our public of this, not only because truth should be known, but also because there is the need to see by example that longer-term political moves must be made and also to see that this present (?delayed) concern about the survival of the independent Serbia would have been too late to save us from the chaos of the disintegration of the existing state had it not been for Serbia, whose Constitution established a necessary and sufficient institutional framework of its survival, that is, completely safeguarded (?itself) in that respect. It was from the position of a stable and united Serbia alone that one could articulate the interest of Serbia and the Serbian people and ensure reasonable behavior to be able to realize this interest.

The Serbian Constitution includes a number of provisions that are not valid while Serbia is in Yugoslavia and come into force when the federation ceases to exist. Therefore, this option of an independent Serbia was possible all the time. However, now when Serbia and Montenegro formulated the bases for the establishment and functioning of Yugoslavia as a joint state, the possibility of an independent Serbia should no longer be on the table, because even a reduced Yugoslavia is a better solution to the Serbian national question than a single Republic of Serbia. Even a reduced Yugoslavia is a more reliable basis for solving the question of the Serbian state than an independent Serbia.

By adopting its Constitution in September 1990, Serbia oriented itself toward radical changes. It decided in favor of market economy and multiparty system. At that time, other Yugoslav republics decided in favor of similar changes, too. The common aim was increasing social and individual standard of living and democratizing political relations.

The process of changes that we wanted to make is still under way, but it is slowed down at the moment, burdened by interethnic conflicts and war that have meanwhile broken out in Yugoslavia and by the attitude the international community has toward the events in Yugoslavia. However, despite such major obstacles and difficulties, Serbia manages to carry out changes in favor of which it decided. In the sphere of economy, the changes imply putting all forms of ownership on an equal footing and stimulating private ownership, which was neglected in the post-war times. The process of these changes is at the beginning, so we can still speak neither about its values nor its shortages. However, we certainly must remove some fallacies at the very beginning and protect ourselves from troubles that can ensue if these fallacies are not cleared up. Above all, the course of the process of changing the ownership structure must have its aims. The changes to the ownership structure must intensify and by no means reduce economic power, something that will undoubtedly happen if one facilely neglects evident attempts to transfer this process into a robbery and brutal squandrance of the property created by many generations since the war.

The process of ownership transformation of a section of the social or state sector into private sector must therefore be put under a very strict control by the government or its institutions. The public justifiably fears dirty dealings and the fact that, as it is usually the case with such a situation, that dishonest people, swindlers, and thieves would fare best in it. Apart from having the task of realizing the program of transforming ownership relations, the new government is obliged to ensure conditions to have this transformation not work to the detriment of citizens and particularly workers, because the aim of changes is to allow people to live better and not worse. If because of these changes they began to live worse, these changes would then be wrong, not right. Also, regarding the (?import) of foreign capital and joint ventures, one must be careful to have Serbia's economic and social interest, which would be served by these moves, precisely established.

In this year and a half since the adoption of the Constitution that introduced these changes into Serbia's economic life, we could have achieved many more results and the picture of our orientation would have be clearer had it not been for the situation in Yugoslavia and the world, which imposed on us the burden of great and (?other) obligations that have made all activities in the economic sphere considerably more difficult. At the same time—both formally as a state and spontaneously through the activity of collectives and citizens—Serbia extended much material aid to Serbs outside Serbia, and primarily in Croatia.

By accepting a large number of refugees from Croatia, Serbia, and particularly Belgrade, have faced a large additional economic burden which was not planned for. This burden came suddenly and caught Serbia unprepared. We have truly shared the difficulties of the refugees from the war-torn regions, but we could not express this solidarity without our own economic and social positions suffering. Due to the wartime conditions and the aid to Serbs outside Serbia, Serbia could not carry out its economic program at the pace and with the results envisioned in peacetime. As we can see, however, even under these conditions, Serbia achieved better results than the rest of Yugoslavia generally did. Therefore, I must now refute these blanket and malicious statements about the disastrous Serbian economy.

From 1988 to 1990, Serbia increased its share of Yugoslavia's gross national product from 35 to 38 percent. It has been documented that Serbia has had the least decline in employment, the highest increase in agricultural production, a smaller decline in industrial production than the Yugoslav average, and recorded many other achievements.

The Serbian economy has perhaps best demonstrated its vitality under the conditions of the dramatic disintegration of Yugoslavia, which included armed conflicts, political pressures, and economic sanctions, when, unlike other republics, it ensured normal economic transactions without the shortages normal under such unfavorable conditions. There is a well-founded expectation that with continued peace, Serbia's expenses will be considerably lower and the economic sanctions will be lifted. There are still, however, many different economic and social difficulties which have a common origin in low levels of production.

It is thus necessary to reach the former level of production, not only in order to solve many short-term problems, but also because the economy thereby gains the self-confidence and enthusiasm necessary to successfully conclude the industrialization process which is well under way.

At the present level of development, Serbia can conclude the industrialization process without applying inhumane methods and without excessive sacrifice by the people. It is fortunate that Serbia has a strong foundation in its developed agricultural production and power generation. Its potential in industrial production must also not be underestimated. The economic blockade of Serbia has shown the extent of the economic stability power generation and agriculture give under extraordinary conditions. They also represent powerful support for future development. This support should also include an abundant and high-quality workforce.

Capital which is, as a rule, the most important factor, does not represent an unsurmountable obstacle either.

Relatively modest investment resources were often idle due to a lack of suitable projects. The fact that capital represents less and less of an obstacle is also shown by the interest foreign investors demonstrate in investing in communications, power generation, and other economic activities in Serbia. The fact that Serbia's share of foreign investment is the largest shows that Serbia does not need anyone to search for investors for it in Europe and the rest of the world. Therefore, all necessary conditions exist for successful Serbian industrialization, and therefore increased income and employment. The prospects of Serbia's economy are clear, but Serbia must fight for a respectable place in the international economy through productive labor, low costs, and quality in its products.

Respected deputies, the authorities constituted after last year's elections and the policy these authorities are carrying out can be and should be criticized by all segments of our society and, under a parliamentary system, by opposition parties as well. Of course, it goes without saying that all that must be done in the interest of the Republic and its citizens. It is fully understandable that, particularly under the conditions of a great economic crisis and a declining standard of living for more than 10 years, it was impossible for society as a whole and for the citizens to get used to a multiparty [Milosevic corrects himself] to a completely different multiparty system quickly, easily, and universally after almost half a century of a one-party system. These difficulties in adjustment, both on the part of the authorities and the opposition, should not be borne by the citizenry, on whose behalf both sides operate.

In our country these difficulties in adjusting to the multiparty system have been manifested, among other things, as a struggle for power, intolerance, and verbal and physical violence. The danger exists that the multiparty system that we advocated will be compromised in the form that exists. I therefore appeal to everyone in Serbia, regardless of ideological, political, religious, and cultural differences, to coordinate their activity, above all with the interests of peace and prosperity in their republic and a better life for each and every citizen.

Serbia now needs from both the authorities and the opposition political proposals and moves that secure peace, economic and cultural prosperity, humane relations among people, and standing in the world. There is no reason for the current authorities in Serbia not to accept one single proposal from the opposition that represents a contribution in this direction. However, proposals that are being put forward by some political parties as Serbia's salvation would find it difficult to be this salvation. For example, I do not believe that things could be better for Serbia if some kind of cantonization were carried out on part of its territory, that is to say, if its territory were again broken into several pieces and the abuse of minority rights were again allowed. The offer of cantonization according to the size of ethnic minorities in some areas of the republic would not only be national treason after the huge efforts that all citizens of Serbia have made in the last few years for Serbia to again become a territorial and political whole, but also an absurdity that not one single state in present day Europe would voluntarily decide upon.

Neither do I believe that things would be better for Serbia if it closed itself into its borders and abandoned the idea of a joint state, just as certainly neither Serbia nor the Serbian people outside Serbia would have benefited from the support—had it borne fruit—that some party leaders and parties were extending to forces which were advocating that the Vance plan should be rejected and the war continued.

It is not that I do not think that these and similar proposals are good, but I think that this country should be protected from such proposals or, if you like, such salvation.

It is not easy for Serbia nowadays, but it will not be helped by pandemonium and threats of violence. Such reactions to our reality will not make it better. On the contrary, they favor those critics of Serbia outside Serbia who warn of our immoderate and insufficiently tolerant and i[illegible]fficiently European behavior in political and other social matters.

Before we angrily reproach the whole world for not respecting us sufficiently or for not respecting us at all, we should ask ourselves whether we respect ourselves by behaving in this way. I do not doubt that most national deputies in this Assembly will sincerely endeavor to make their maximal contribution in the interests of peace, economic and cultural prosperity, humane relations among people, and Serbia's standing in the world. I wish all of you much success in this. [applause]

Finally, at the very end, I propose that the National Assembly adopt the document that the delegations of the republics of Serbia and Montenegro have agreed upon.

Thank you for listening. [applause]

Deputies Debate Milosevic Speech

AU2702123492

[Editorial Report] Belgrade Radio Beograd Network in Serbo-Croatian, together with Pristina Radio in Serbian, Montenegrin Radio, the Serbian Radio Network, and Knin Serbian Radio, at 1024 GMT on 27 February resumes its live relay of the first extraordinary session of the Assembly of the Republic of Serbia in Belgrade.

After Milosevic concludes his speech, Assembly President Aleksandar Bakocevic proposes a 30-minute recess after which there will be a debate on Milosevic's speech.

Aleksandar Bakocevic announces the resumption of the session by saying that there are now 232 deputies present and 25 have applied to speak in the debate. He suggests that speeches be restricted to a maximum of 10 minutes.

Aleksandar Prlja takes the floor and speaks about the difficult conditions in the country at the moment. He

stresses the importance of the way in which democracy has developed, particularly in the Serbian Assembly.

Prlja is followed by Batric Jovanovic who supports Slobodan Milosevic's speech and explains the history of relations between Serbia and Montenegro and the importance of their forming a joint state.

Milan Paroski speaks in general terms about the importance of the integration of all Serbian states. He says that Serbia should be defended in Knin and calls for Milosevic to be made the commander of a professional Serbian army. He also calls for local elections to be held immediately throughout Serbia. Paroski concludes by asking Milosevic to reach agreement with all Serbian states and hopes that the agreement with Montenegro will be implemented.

Zoran Horvan speaks about the way in which peasants are hit by the bad state of the economy. He blames Milosevic for the economic chaos in Serbia and goes on to criticize him for his actions during the war and his changed opinion on the UN peacekeeping forces. He says that "the war was not conducted to gain territories or to defend the threatened Serbs, but the war was conducted in order for power to be preserved after 9 March last year."

Horvan concludes by saying that the Serbian people are divided over one man and if he really cared about Serbia he should either resign or change his policy in order to overcome the differences.

Vojislav Seselj begins his speech by expressing satisfaction with Serbia's achievements in the war and his party's contribution to them. He goes on to criticize the existing government for mistakes in economic policy last year, particularly as regards delay in privatization and the social position of parts of society.

He advocates the concept of a "shortened" Yugoslavia, even if this means present-day Serbia as this would mean that Serbia would not have to ask the EC for recognition and be subject to its "blackmail" regarding Kosovo and Vojvodina.

Seselj goes on to talk about the organizers of the 9 March rally as "traitors" and says that they can only cause bloodshed. He criticizes parts of the opposition who "have constantly acted against Serbian national interests" and says that it is not democratic for them to bring down the government in the streets when democratic elections have already been held.

Antonije Isakovic approves of the government's policies and Milosevic's speech. He criticizes Horvan for having read a prepared speech.

Horvan reacts to Isakovic's criticism, but also reproaches some opposition parties for not really being part of the opposition.

Vojislav Seselj responds to Horvan by explaining his view of the opposition. He says that 9 March last year was used by Tudjman to prepare an attack on Pakrac, so who knows what will happen this year. He then blames Veljko Kadijevic for military defeats in Croatia.

Bogdan Trifunovic speaks on the need to preserve peace as well as to resolve the economic crisis.

Zoran Djindjic speaks about the fact that Milosevic's promises have not been fulfilled and he criticizes the president for being the main obstacle to the republic's progress.

Djindjic is followed by an unidentified deputy named Hodza, who says that problems do not lie with the authorities but with attempts to undermine the authorities.

Serbian Prime Minister Radoman Bozovic speaks in general terms about the government's economic policies.

Serbian Prime Minister Radoman Bozovic' speech is followed by speeches by five deputies who voice general approval of Slobodan Milosevic's speech.

Jozef (?Kasup) speaks on the bad economic situation in the republic and the behavior of certain Serbian media which does not help the situation in multinational areas.

He is followed by Vladislav Jovanovic, republican minister for foreign affairs, who responds to some comments that have been made about Serbian diplomatic activity and explains the role that the UN peacekeeping forces will have in Yugoslavia.

In reply to a question that was raised earlier about how the Serbian Krajinas will join Yugoslavia and Serbia, Jovanovic says: "We have never worked toward the Serbian krajinas joining Serbia because we have never had territorial or other pretensions. From the beginning, our aim has been—and remains and will continue to be—to offer consistent principled unhesitating support for the exercise of the basic national rights of the Serbian people in these krajinas for freedom and security. This was the point of the beginning and the end of our entire involvement as a republic in the crisis that arose, as we have heard here and as U.S. Secretary of State James Baker stated, because the secessionists in the north used force in order to achieve their aim.

"Therefore, the solution for the krajinas is not in the question of whether they will accede, and when and to what extent, but whether, when, and to what extent they will exercise the legitimate rights they have on the basis of the Constitution of Yugoslavia and on the basis of international legal and political documents and on the basis of self-determination, which is the essence of the proposed document on the so-called special status. This status will be agreed upon by the direct representatives of the Krajina [as heard] and Croatia and, of course, the population will finally be consulted and will have the last word on how they imagine their future: whether they will want to adopt this kind of proposed special status or whether they will ask for something else.

"In essence, this involves a way of expressing the right to self- determination, which can be called either a plebiscite or consultations depending on what is agreed upon by the sides negotiating this."

Jovanovic goes on to speak about the withdrawal of the Yugoslav People's Army from the zones that will be protected by the United Nations. He says that this "is no kind of military defeat nor recognition that the Yugoslav People's Army was an alleged aggressor. This is simply a logical fact of the traditional stand and practice of the United Nations that in all such peace operations there must be a total demilitarization of the area in question because the supreme authority of the United Nations would not tolerate any other kind of parallel authority. This is a principle of the work of the United Nations to which there have been no exceptions in any actions by the United Nations so far in similar cases.

"This is also being done according to Cyrus Vance's plan. This essentially means that the federal Army, which has so far had the task of protecting the freedom and security of the biological survival of the Serbian people in these krajinas, will this time be replaced in this role by the peacekeeping forces of the United Nations. It is much better and safer for freedom and security to be defended by the United Nations and 180 countries of the world rather than by the army of only one country. Finally, this is confirmation of the correctness of our entire stand throughout this entire period that the situation there in these krajinas involved organized state and military violence against the civilian Serbian population and if this were not the case, if this were not true, the United Nations would not have found it necessary to now send its own forces to replace the federal Army in extending this essential protection to the Serbian population in these krajinas."

Jovanovic continues by speaking about Serbia's foreign affairs activity and the increasing understanding and support it is receiving from other countries. As regards relations with other countries, Jovanovic says: "We have included everybody in our political activity with direct political contacts and various forms of bilateral cooperation with all neighboring countries apart from Albania. I say, apart from Albania, because it has directly sinned regarding the basic principles of international law and the norms of good-neighborly relations because it dared to commit the greatest crime in international relations and recognizes the illegal act of setting up the independent state of Kosovo. This will be a subject of international attention at CSCE meetings and other meetings because this is obviously conduct that is absolutely below all standards and that should not be taken on board or accepted and supported as a possible precedent.

"We are of course ready to develop goodneighborly relations with Albania because it is a neighboring country with which we have had a lot in common throughout history. We are ready to do this on the principles of good neighborliness, reciprocity, mutual respect, and non-interference."

Jovanovic ends his speech and is followed by several deputies who broadly support Milosevic's speech.

An unidentified speaker gives a speech, who is followed by Milos Bajovic. The latter speaks in general terms about democracy and the role of the media.

Radoman Bozovic speaks against the idea that proposals on the banking system should be changed.

After an unidentified deputy replies to Bajovic, Vojislav Kostunica speaks about the ways in which Milosevic has acted on his own initiative against the Constitution and without consulting the Serbian Assembly, regarding such things as the signing of cease-fires and talks on the future of Serbia and Montenegro. He also criticizes Milosevic for his attitude toward Milan Babic and the Republic of Serbian Krajina.

Borivoje Petrovic speaks about disagreements and the different views that have been expressed. He criticizes the organizers of the 9 March rally for having a prepared plan for a "massacre" and calls on parents not to allow their children to attend the rally.

Duka Arsic praises Milosevic's speech as confirmation of his wisdom.

Dragan Jevtovic criticizes the president and ruling party for advocating the continuation of Yugoslavia and the maintenance of an army that is too big. He also speaks about the economic problems in the republic.

Dragoljub Micunovic takes the floor and criticizes Bakocevic for not conducting the Assembly proceedings properly. He points out that the debate has been rather strange since most of the discussion has not involved Milosevic's speech at all. He criticizes Milosevic for only mentioning the proposal on Serb-Montenegrin unity in passing and not devoting more attention to it.

He continues by discussing the state and meaning of democracy in Serbia and concludes his speech by calling for new elections.

Oskar Kovac supports Milosevic's claim that there is a growing feeling in the world that Yugoslavia should be preserved and backs this up with several examples. He then goes on to speak about the economic rationale behind a union between Serbia and Montenegro.

Borisav Jovic takes the floor saying: "It is my firm belief that Serbia is taking the best way to realize its historical interests and the historical aims and interests of the Serbian people. If we work sufficiently rationally and prudently, I personally believe that there is hardly anyone who could stop us in this.

"We have completed the most difficult part of the journey. We have survived the danger of remaining alone. We have survived a time during which very few people believed that, confronted with the might and interests of great powers, we could realize our rights. I think that we have passed this crisis and that we have

many more chances to realize our aspirations and our rights. It is my firm belief, and I am convinced that the majority of people also think the same, that Serbia has many reasons to be proud of the dignity of the policy conducted by our republic. This can be heard from many people.

"I understand the opposition's reasons for criticizing such a policy, although this should not happen when it comes to the interests of the people. However, not elaborating on what has been achieved, this was presented by the president in his speech, I must say that we still face a thorny and difficult road."

Jovic then goes on to explain some achievements of the present leadership and to defend the SFRY Presidency's policy on the Krajinas and the reasons why the SFRY Presidency agreed to the EC's mediation in the Yugoslav crisis.

Defending the SFRY Presidency's policy concerning the withdrawal of the Army from various parts of the country, Jovic says: "We could not, nor would this be possible today, regardless of who is in power, defend those territories that decided through the will of the people to leave Yugoslavia. We never kept the Slovenes from leaving Yugoslavia. We only did not agree that they should leave by force. We demanded that this be settled in line with the Constitution and law. We never kept the Croats from leaving Yugoslavia. We did not agree that they should take the Serbian people out by force, nor that they should leave by force themselves until we had settled accounts."

Regarding Macedonia, he says: "There are no more Macedonians in the Yugoslav People's Army. They are not serving our Army. There are a couple thousand of them. They are ending their service now and returning to Macedonia. Should we protect their borders? I do not think that this is necessary. They have decided to leave Yugoslavia. They voted to leave Yugoslavia. Should we bring them back to Yugoslavia by force? If they decide to be in some kind of union with us, they will be in it. I do not think that the presidency can do anything but withdraw the Army to the territories where people want it to be stationed and where it will be recognized, where it belongs. It should not protect the territory of people who do not have soldiers in it or finance it."

Slobodan Raketic takes the floor and talks about poverty in Serbia and general discontent. According to him, "Serbia's union with Montenegro does not solve the Serbian national question, because many Serbs would be left out of this state in Croatia, Bosnia, and Macedonia."

Raketic then goes on to talk about Cyrus Vance's plan. He concludes his speech by criticizing the infrequent work of the Serbian Assembly.

Raketic is followed by several more deputies who alternately support and criticize the policies of the ruling party.

Assembly President Bakocevic asks President Milosevic whether he would like to reply to the criticisms made by some deputies during the debate.

Milosevic takes the floor and says that peace is the best method for achieving Serbia's interests. He then goes on to talk about why industrialization in Serbia is necessary, the future of the Army, the EC's mediation in the Yugoslav crisis, parliamentarism in Serbia, and his infrequent appearances in the Assembly.

At the end of his speech Milosevic says: "As far as I am personally concerned, I am trying to do my job the best I can, and I intend to continue the way I have been working so far. In other words, I do not intend to change anything."

The president of the Assembly takes the floor again and says that two days ago the committee for constitutional matters of the Serbian Assembly accepted the stands negotiated between the leaderships of Montenegro and Serbia and that it has prepared draft conclusions that were handed out to the deputies. He then puts the committee's conclusions to a vote. The draft conclusions are adopted with seven votes against and 12 abstentions.

Bakocevic says that the Assembly will continue work tomorrow.

Assembly Supports Peace Moves

LD2802063892 Belgrade TANJUG in English 0309 GMT 28 Feb 92

[Text] Belgrade, February 27 (TANJUG)—The Assembly of the Yugoslav Republic of Serbia late on Thursday [27 February] adopted conclusions on the address by President of the Republic Slobodan Milosevic in which it fully supports his activities so far towards the settlement of the Yugoslav crisis. The conclusions were adopted after a 13-hour debate in which 50 deputies, or one-fifth of the total number, participated.

The U.N. Security Council decision to send a peace-keeping force to crisis regions in Yugoslavia represents a victory for peace and the affirmation of Serbia's efforts in the world to stop the violence against the Serbian people by the Croatian authorities, which is at the root of the Yugoslav crisis, and to resolve that crisis peacefully, by political means, and not by war, the Serbian Assembly said in its conclusions. The document underscores that the preservation of Yugoslavia as a common state of those Yugoslav peoples who wish it is supported by the international community as well.

This contributes to stability and peace in the region and facilitates the process of linking and integration in the new conditions within the framework of the political negotiating process, the document adds. The Assembly of Serbia again underscores that the securing and protection of the national, political and physical integrity of the Serbian people living outside the territories of that Republic is the inalienable constitutional right and obligation of the Republic's bodies and its citizens.

The Republic of Serbia will extend political, material and every other kind of assistance to the Serbian people living outside its territory with the aim of the achieving of their legitimate right to self-determination and the protection of their national and human rights and freedoms, the Assembly said in its document. The conclusions further say that the Serbian Assembly, in keeping with the earlier accepted Belgrade initiative for a peaceful and democratic settlement of the Yugoslav crisis and the foundations for the organization of relations in Yugoslavia, gives full support to the agreement between the top representatives of the Republic of Serbia and the Republic of Montenegro on a common state.

The preservation of Yugoslavia's continuity as a common state is of great importance for achieving the vital interests of the peoples of Serbia and Montenegro, the document says. The Assembly calls on the government and other state bodies and the citizens of the Republic to give their maximum contribution to the soonest possible implementation of constitutional solutions with the aim of ensuring Serbia's economic and social progress and the democratization of political relations in it founded on a multi-party system and the respect of human rights and freedoms.

This can be achieved successfully only if the ethnic, religious, political and other differences that objectively exist among the citizens of Serbia are expressed and adjusted within the frameworks of democratic institutions and the norms of the consitutional system and if everyone refrains from unconstitutional acts that are unappropriate for democracy and the time in which we live, the document says. The basic direction of the activity of all subjects should be towards what is of interest for Serbia and its citizens, which is the securing of a peaceful life, economic progress, respect of human rights and preservation and development of humane relations among people, the document concludes.

Foreign Media Reaction to Milosevic Report Cited

LD2702225592 Belgrade TANJUG in English 2055 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Belgrade, Feb 27 (TANJUG)—In their commentaries on the report submitted by Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic to the republican parliament today, foreign news agencies lay special emphasis on his statement that the civil war in Yugoslavia is over. Milosevic urged the preservation of Yugoslavia and vowed that Serbia would not follow suit of the other Yugoslav republics which have sought international recognition, says REUTERS in its report from the Serbian assembly session in Belgrade. The agency quotes Milosevic as saying that even a small Yugoslavia is a much better option for resolving the Serbian national question than a lone Republic of Serbia, and that the imminent deployment of a UN peacekeeping force in Yugoslavia to separate Croats and Serbs undoubtedly heralds an end to armed conflicts. The president of Serbia called on parliament to approve the proposed alliance with Montenegro as the core of a new Yugoslav federation, says REUTERS.

The ASSOCIATED PRESS quotes Milosevic as saying that the soldiers can now return home, and that Serbia will at last be free to grapple with its economic problems. FRANCE PRESSE focuses on Milosevic's statement that the violent and unilateral secession of Slovenia and Croatia has opened the problems of borders, sovereignty and human rights, which has culminated in the armed conflict and bloodshed. The French news agency also carries Milosevic's statement to the effect that, since the victory of President Tudjman's ultra-right Croatian Democratic Union in the Croatian elections, the authorities in Croatia have been treating Serbs as second-class citizens... to which Serbs have reacted promptly and forcefully.

The UPI stresses that Milosevic has admitted that the communist regime in Serbia has supported the armed rebellion of Serbs in Croatia both militarily and financially. Radio France Internationale says that Milosevic had been expected to make some concessions in his report because there have been rumours of a national salvation government and preparations for early elections, but nothing has come of it.

Noting that opposition deputies have resolutely opposed Milosevic's claims and insisted on calling early elections and on Milosevic's resignation, the radio says that the opposition is much less powerful in parliament that in the streets. It would appear that the parliamentary debate has done nothing to diminish the reasons and intention for staging demonstrations on March 9, the radio says in conclusion.

Bozovic Opposes Magyars' Demands for Autonomy

LD2802094892 Budapest MTV Television Network in Hungarian 0530 GMT 28 Feb 92

[Excerpts] In the Belgrade Assembly, the Serb president again emphasized that Yugoslavia still exists and his country is not going to give up the territories of Croatia inhabited by Serbs. [passage omitted]. Shortly after the session, the Serb head of government, Bozovic, in his statement given to Hungarian Television, called the demands for territorial autonomy by the Magyars of Vojvodina and the Albanians of Kosovo unacceptable. He argued that while the Serbs living in the Croatian regions are members of a state-creating nation, the Magyars and the Albanians are mere minorities.

Bozovic: Serbs Unlike Hungarians, Albanians

LD2702203492 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1912 GMT 27 Feb 92

[Text] Belgrade, February 27 (TANJUG)—Serbian Prime Minister Dr. Radoman Bozovic has said in an

interview to Hungarian state television that it is (?untenable) and inacceptable to compare the demands for autonomy which come from the Serbian nation in the breakaway Yugoslav republic of Croatia with those from the Hungarian national minority in Vojvodina and the Albanians in Kosovo-Metohija. In the first case, Bozovic said, the demands are made by a constituent nation to preserve the elementary rights which every constituent nation enjoys in a state, rights which all Croatian constitutions so far recognized for the Serbian nation in Croatia, until last year's.

The demands of the Serbian nation in Croatia, Bozovic said, are only a reaction to the elimination of this nation from the Croatian constitution and an answer to the violence, coupled with genocide, shown by the Croatian authorities. In the case of Hungarians in Vojvodina and Albanians in Kosovo- Metohija, they are not constituent nations but national minorities and are equal to all other citizens of Serbia, under the Serbian republican constitution and on the grounds of the actually realized (?rights).

The mere fact that a large number of Hungarians and Albanians live in Vojvodina and Kosovo, respectively, is the best proof that these national minorities are not exposed to assimilation, such as is the case with the Serb national minority in Hungary or Albania. Ethnic Hungarians and Albanians actually have the highest level of democratic rights which are granted to national minorities in contemporary Europe, and the State of Serbia guarantees such rights to them in future as well. They enjoy full cultural autonomy (schools, news media...), but as national minority they cannot have territorial autonomy as well.

Furthermore, the main reason which led Serbs in Croatia to seek the protection of their rights through territorial autonomy does not exist in Serbia - party and state terror over a minority nation. Demands for territorial autonomy are actually a step back to feudalism, which is against the contemporary trends of civilization in Europe.

Asked about territorial aspirations of Serbia against Croatia, Bozovic rejected this as nonsense. It is not Serbia's ambition to expand its borders towards Krajina and Baranja, but only that Serbs who are a majority population in these territories be given the same rights that are given to the other constituent nation—Croats, Serbian Prime Minister Radoman Bozovic pointed out, among other things, in his interview to Hungarian state television.

Liberal Party Leader Says Opposition Ineffective

92BA0529A Belgrade NIN in Serbo-Croatian
14 Feb 92 pp 19-21

[Interview with Dr. Kosta Cavoski, professor and leader of the Serbian Liberal Party, by Luka Miceta; place and date not given: "The Right To Rebel"]

[Text] Montesquieu wrote it long ago: "There are two kinds of corruption. One when the people do not obey the laws, and the other when the laws themselves corrupt them; the latter evil is incurable, because it is in the remedy itself."

Professor Kosta Cavoski, one of the leaders of the Serbian Liberal Party [SLS], spoke to NIN about precisely this problem. About the evil in the remedy itself. If there is any remedy and salvation for us.

[Miceta] Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson inscribed on the seal of the state of Virginia the dictum: "Resistance to tyranny is obedience to God." In 1776, the Massachusetts State Supreme Court concluded that resistance must be offered when "kings disgrace their power." It is similarly written in the Montagnard Constitution of 1793. However, the right to rebel has not been legalized in any constitution now valid or international document on human rights. Why is it that the right to rebel cannot be guaranteed in positive legislation? Is this right perhaps above the constitution and outside the law?

[Cavoski] The right to rebel is one of the most important, if not the most important, natural right. It is in that sense a supreme right that stands above any positive legal order. It is very difficult to guarantee that right to rebel in any positive legal enactment or constitution; for example, it would not be enough to guarantee the right to rebel, but the conditions would also have to be set forth under which that right can be exercised. That means that the current authority adopting the constitution must set forth very precise conditions under which that same authority may be brought down. In that case, there is no judge that could ascertain in a disinterested manner whether those conditions obtain and, if they have been fulfilled, whether the people have the right to rebel. So, the conditions cannot be set forth in advance. Second, it is not possible to state how many citizens are assuming the right to carry out a rebellion. And finally, it is not possible to guarantee that if the conditions are met, the rebellion itself will be successful. If it succeeds, then it is established post festum [too late] that the conditions have been met. If the rebellion is unsuccessful, then it is assumed that this is high treason and the rebels are tried.

[Miceta] Rights to rebel were incorporated after the war in the constitutions of the German cities Essen, Bremen, and Berlin.

[Cavoski] Incorporation of that right to rebel in the constitutions of certain German federal units, members of the German federation, was the result of the fresh memory of the tyranny they had experienced. But the actual Constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany does not guarantee that right. This is more a political right and threat against the current authority, lest it become corrupt. The people, of course, have a natural right to resort to rebellion if the government becomes insupportable. But as Jefferson said in the draft of his Declaration of Independence, and here he was actually

paraphrasing John Locke: Crimes committed by the constituted authority must, first, be great; second, they must take place over a relatively lengthy period of time, for the people to acquire that natural right to rebel. So, I think that every people and every citizen possesses the right to rebel, but as a natural right, and they take it into their hands themselves, at their own risk and on their own responsibility.

[Miceta] Four years ago, you defined despotism as follows in an article entitled "Prisoners of Conscience": "Despotism prevails in a state if the laws are adopted and executed by one and the same authority." Because a republic is based above all on separation of powers, can it be said that the government in the Republic of Serbia is a despotic authority?

[Cavoski] I was actually only paraphrasing Montesquieu, who insists on the separation of powers. His idea is that if the same authority both enacts and executes the laws, this is a despotic authority, or tyranny.

In our constitutional system, viewed from the standpoint of formal law, the legislative authority on the one hand and executive or presidential authority on the other are strictly separate. But in political terms practically the entire authority is concentrated in the hands of the president of the republic. The most important political decisions are made in his office, including even decisions on adoption of laws, which later he himself implements in practice thanks to the immense majority of his deputies in the parliament. On those grounds, it can be said that we have neither separation of powers, nor a parliamentary system, but a kind of caesarist authority resting exclusively in the hands of Mr. Slobodan Milosevic.

[Miceta] Which means the Serbs have the right to rebel?

[Cavoski] The Serbs, in my opinion, have the right to rebel insofar as they conclude—and, of course, this would have to be concluded by a large number of Serbs—that the violations of the Constitution and injustices inflicted on them are great and protracted. As far as I personally am concerned, because I am a liberal and belong to the Serbian Liberal Party, I nevertheless prefer constitutional forms of struggle, i.e., above all parliamentary forms of struggle and passive resistance, which all constitutions in the world of democratic states allow. So, I personally do not favor armed rebellion, although I do not deny others that right. I would not take part in that. I prefer the use of nonparliamentary forms of struggle such as demonstrations, mass rallies, protests, the signing of petitions, and so on. In any case, I think that this authority is sufficiently caesarist and despotic to deserve to be brought down.

[Miceta] In a recent interview in NIN, Prof. Ljubomir Tadic said that insufficient use has been made of democratic parliamentary forms of struggle and that it is premature to resort to nonparliamentary forms of resistance to the regime.

[Cavoski] I am afraid that esteemed Prof. Ljubomir Tadic is grossly in error. If parliamentary forms of struggle were effective, they would have yielded some results. From the very beginning, there was no prospect whatsoever for the opposition to achieve anything in the present parliament. I will illustrate that with an example: Even when the operating procedure of the parliament was being adopted, the ruling majority denied the opposition the right to interpellation. This is the right that a minority group enjoys in all democratic parliaments in the world. This is the right of one group of deputies to open political debate concerning any important political issue. Thanks to an operating procedure that excludes the right of interpellation, the ruling majority can by procedural means frustrate any attempt to put an item on the agenda, and it does this regularly. There are many other grounds for the conclusion that the opposition should long ago have left the parliament and removed the fig leaf from the communist monopoly and thereby erase even the last trace of legitimacy of that representative body. The parliamentary opposition has not done that, and for that reason it shares responsibility for the very poor and unsuccessful work of the National Assembly.

[Miceta] The opposition consented to that when it agreed to enter the elections the year before last.

[Cavoski] Certainly, that was a big mistake. I belonged to that group of members of the Main Committee of the Democratic Party that resolutely opposed entering the elections under unequal conditions. We felt that, because the incumbent party held a monopoly over television, over the other key news media, over the public and secret police, and over the financial resources, they could not expect equal conditions in the competition for the average voters and that they should not enter those elections.

[Miceta] Soon there will be opstina elections. Is the opposition aware now of its strength, and have the conditions changed now by at least a shade as compared to the previous elections?

[Cavoski] I think that the opstina elections are being intensively prepared, and the best sign is the promise of Mr. Radoman Bozovic that in coming months, before the election, pensioners will be getting their pensions on the first of every month. That means that the incumbent party, as far as it is concerned, has already entered seriously into the election campaign. Another sign is the purge in television and the installation of rigid communist personnel. Those few journalists who escaped the control of the incumbent party are now either being removed or displaced by the rigid ones, who will have a run of only one summer, that is, until the end of these elections, after which they themselves will be removed. As for the party to which I belong, the Serbian Liberal Party, we favor a boycott of these elections as well, because nothing has changed.

[Miceta] The Democratic Party and its leader, Dr. Dragoljub Micunovic, recently proposed that Slobodan Milosevic, president of the republic, submit his resignation. This is what you, too, have been advocating?

[Cavoski] Mr. Dragoljub Micunovic decided to attack Slobodan Milosevic and demand his resignation, which means that Slobodan Milosevic is in a bad way. Otherwise, Dragoljub Micunovic would certainly not have done that. He has most probably judged that Slobodan Milosevic is in an inextricable position. Without going into the reasons guiding the Democratic Party, I think that their position at this moment is entirely correct, and that the opposition should in no case consent to any elections that would be organized by Slobodan Milosevic and his government. They first need to resign, to step down from power. A so-called transitional and neutral government should be formed that would adopt political laws—laws on elections, on the free press, and on financing political parties—and it should organize new elections. I think it would be best to organize first, as Vojislav Kostunica has proposed, elections to a constitutional assembly, and then, after the new constitution is adopted, move on to new republic and opstina elections.

[Miceta] Is it certain that the government will not do that?

[Cavoski] The government will not do that unless it is compelled. It will be compelled if a critical mass of citizens goes out into the streets and remains in them until Slobodan Milosevic withdraws. The occasion for that, in my opinion, will soon present itself—either just in advance of Vuk Draskovic's trial, which the incumbent party intends to organize, or perhaps on 9 March, or perhaps on some other occasion that will arise unexpectedly.

[Miceta] You wrote back in 1988: "Even a one-party government can be exceedingly legitimate, provided only that it is based on the validly obtained consent of the people (consensus populi)." Today, we have a one-party government. Is it legitimate?

[Cavoski] To be quite honest, the first question that arises is the legitimacy of the elections on 9 December 1990. If someone concludes that those elections are legitimate, then, of course, the government of those Communists in new clothes is legitimate. In my judgment, those elections were not legitimate.

[Miceta] In his time, Nikolay Vasilyevich Krilenko, Soviet supreme prosecutor, felt that the courts were an instrument in the class struggle of the workers against their enemies. He was able to do that, because Lenin himself advised that the courts should use terror when he said: "The courts should not preclude terror; to promise that would be self-deception or deception." To what extent is this conception of the courts valid even today, in view of the fact that even now there is party paternalism over the courts, which is confirmed as clear as day by the upcoming trial of Vuk Draskovic?

[Cavoski] The upcoming trial of Vuk Draskovic is the best example that our courts are still not independent. The present government managed to railroad through the Assembly a law whereby all judges are up for sale. At this moment, all judges are subject to reappointment. The judges will be reappointed, but it appears that the number of judges will be reduced by 20 percent, so that one out of every five will not be reappointed. And because it is not known in advance who that fifth one will be, every judge is literally afraid that he will lose his job. No judge can be independent when he is subject to that kind of fear for his livelihood. The judge who will try Vuk Draskovic also does not know whether he will or will not be reappointed. The second reason is an unexpected statement by Prof. Mihajlo Markovic, vice president of the incumbent party, which, if what the papers have said is true, states that the incumbent party, after filing charges against Vuk Draskovic, will organize the trial of Vuk Draskovic if and when it finds that suitable.

[Miceta] The American Constitution, which dates from 1787, explicitly states that treason against the United States consists only of making war against it or joining its enemies. The term "treason" is today being used groundlessly and frequently to discredit a political opponent. How do you look upon the use of this qualifier in the political struggle at the moment, when the incumbent party almost regularly resorts to it either directly or through its satellites in certain so-called opposition parties?

[Cavoski] So-called high treason has always been a crime that could be abused. That certain political statements and political activities are so described under our conditions without much thought merely indicates that we still do not have elementary legal security and that that crime, which must be very clearly and comprehensively defined, is being abused by certain political figures who are in power in order to intimidate the opposition.

[Miceta] Today, we might wonder of what treason actually consists. Is it treason to postpone the creation of a Serbian state, that is, a state of Serbia, and to insist on some phantom state that would be called a truncated Yugoslavia, or is it treason when someone refuses to fight for something he does not perceive as his own and for a state which is utterly unclear in both geographic and conceptual terms?

[Cavoski] Because the word "treason" is a very serious and grave qualifier, I would use the word "betrayal." That is, when it comes to betrayal of national interests, then we really can say that the present government in Serbia has betrayed Serbian national interests, because it has not brought about what it promised the people—a state in which most of the Serbian people would live.

[Miceta] With cries of "Loot, loot!" Turkish soldiers accepted the words of Mehmet the Conqueror, who promised the right to loot for three days when Istanbul, the last bulwark of the eastern Roman Empire, was taken. The right to loot also took other forms: In 1832,

William Marcy, New York senator, said: "To the victor belong the spoils," thereby justifying the dismissal of officials belonging to the defeated party and their replacement by members of the winning party. The principle of spoils is in effect even today. It seems that this is one of the strongest motives for participating in this senseless war.

[Cavoski] We have just made a new contribution to that political tradition. In addition to the saying that the spoils go to the victor, we have introduced a new slogan—the spoils go to the defeated. That is, that Yugoslav Army that was defeated in Slovenia and that has not conducted war successfully in Croatia has actually allowed that looting. This only indicates that this is a very shaky and unreliable army, an army incapable of preserving discipline and unable to prevent looting on the spot. That kind of army, which is rotten from within, cannot be a real participant in any honest and worthwhile struggle for a real cause.

[Miceta] You were a fellow student of Mr. Slobodan Milosevic. There are those who think that your animosity toward Mr. Milosevic dates from that time.

[Cavoski] That is nothing more than guesswork.

[Miceta] It is said that you were great friends.

[Cavoski] Yes, there was a circle of colleagues and friends that included, for instance, Nebojsa Popov, Slobodan Milosevic, me, and a number of other people who were active at that time in the School of Law. At that time, when we were students, there was no trace from which one might suspect that life would later cast us on different sides. I say quite sincerely that when we were students there were no disagreements whatsoever or anything that might later create bad blood. On the contrary, our relations at that time were very good, even friendly.

[Miceta] Opinions have been coming from the SPS [Serbian Socialist Party] and from intellectuals close to it that you have a fixation on Slobodan Milosevic.

[Cavoski] If Slobodan Milosevic were not in the position he now holds, I would not have written a word about him, just as most probably I would not write about him from the very moment he left that position, except that I would issue a second edition of my book *Slobodan Protiv Slobode* [*Slobodan Against Freedom*]. So, the reason why I was motivated to write a book about him is the fact that he occupies the most prominent position in Serbia and from that position is influencing the destiny of all of us in a decisive way. That is the reason that led me to write a book about Josip Broz as well: *Tito—Tehnologija Vlasti* [*Tito—The Technology of Power*].

[Miceta] Fine, but Broz was not your friend, but this man is. Was there any emotional inhibition?

[Cavoski] I do not think so. As far as I am personally concerned, I believe that I have been unbiased toward the subject of my research, and I can even say that because the book was finished somewhere around 20 May of last year that the judgments that I pronounced at that time were not stern enough in view of what Milosevic undertook later. My forecasts in that regard were not altogether accurate, because he afterward showed a much greater inclination to autocracy than I could have foreseen.

[Miceta] Do you think that there is a figure in Serbia's political opposition who could surpass him in political skill, defeat him, and displace him?

[Cavoski] That all depends on what an ambitious man decides. If he intends to use the same political weapons Milosevic uses, then he will not be an oppositionist, but he will be a potential autocrat. Every oppositionist who uses only honorable weapons of political struggle—and by honorable weapons I above all mean persuasion and not violence—will be weaker than Slobodan Milosevic. What needs to be done is not to find an appropriate rival for Slobodan Milosevic, who will surpass him in that skill of political struggle with morally questionable weapons, but we need to bring about the conditions for Serbia to become a democratic country and to incorporate in the Constitution and laws those corrective factors and institutions that will make it impossible for any new Caesar or tyrant to emerge.